

CONTENTS.

I	Introductory -- the Protector - Resolutioner Controversy.	p.1.
II	James Sharp and the Resolutioners - his mission to Cromwell.	18.
III	Sharp's mission to General Monk.	38.
IV	The English Presbyterians and the Solemn League and Covenant -- Sharp's mission to the King.	61.
V	The King's Letter to the Presbytery of Edinburgh -- Scotland and the Restoration.	89.
VI	JAMES SHARP, ARCHBISHOP OF ST. ANDREWS, AND THE RESTORATION OF EPISCOPACY IN SCOTLAND.	
VII	Conclusion.	140.
VIII	List of Authorities cited in Foot-notes	11.

NISI DOMINUS FRUSTRA.

(Edin. 1906) Ph. D. (Lond.)



1940

CONTENTS.

I	Introductory -- the Protestor - Resolutioner Controversy.	p.1.
II	James Sharp and the Resolutioners - his mission to Cromwell.	18.
III	Sharp's mission to General Monck.	38.
IV	The English Presbyterians and the Solemn League and Covenant -- Sharp's mission to the King.	61.
V	The King's Letter to the Presbytery of Edinburgh -- Scotland and the Restoration.	85.
VI	Scotland's Restoration Parliament -- Preparations for the introduction of Episcopacy.	114.
VII	The Restoration of Episcopacy.	140.
VIII	Conclusion.	
	List of Authorities cited in Foot-notes	ii.

- Calendar of State Papers (Domestic). 1651-2, 1656-9, 1659-60.
- Clarendon State Papers. Vol.3.
- Clarendon, Edward, Earl of. History of the Rebellion. Ed. V.D. Macaulay. Vol.6.
- Clarke Papers. Vol.4. Ed. C.H. Firth. (Royal Historical Society)
- The Cromwellian Union. Ed. C. Sanford Terry. (Scottish History Society.)
- Dictionary of National Biography.
- Fasti Ecclesiae Scotticae. Vol.7.
- The Form and Order of the King's Coronation, 1651.
- Gardiner, S. R. History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. Vol.1.
- History of the Great Civil War. Vol.4.
- Gordon, J. History of Scots Affairs. Vol.1.
- Guthrie, G. An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Vol.3.

Bibliography.

(List of authorities cited in foot notes.)

- Acts of the Parliament of Scotland. Vols.vi. & vii.
- Annals of Banff. (New Spalding Club). 2 Vols.
- Baillie, Robert. Letters and Journals. (Bannatyne Club) Vols. 1 & 3.
- Balfour, James. Historical Works. Vol.4.
- Baxter, Richard, Reliquiae Baxterianae. 1696.
- Brodie, Alexander, of Brodie. Diary. (Spalding Club).
- Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, vii.pp.73 ff.
Eleven Letters of John, Second Earl of Lauderdale
to Richard Baxter. Ed. F.J. Powicke.
- Burnet, Gilbert. History of His Own Times. Ed. O. Airy. Vol.1.
- Calendar of State Papers (Domestic). 1651-2,1658-9,1659-60.
- Calendar of Clarendon State Papers. Vol. 4.
- Clarendon State Papers. Vol.3.
- Clarendon, Edward, Earl of. History of the Rebellion. Ed. W.D. Macray
Vol.6.
- Clarke Papers. Vol.4. Ed. C.H. Firth. (Royal Historical Society)
- The Cromwellian Union. Ed. C. Sanford Terry. (Scottish History
Society.)
- Dictionary of National Biography.
- Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae. Vol.7.
- The Form and Order of the King's Coronation, 1651.
- Gardiner, S. R. History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate.
Vol.1.
- History of the Great Civil War. Vol.4.
- Gordon, J. History of Scots Affairs. Vol.1.
- Grub, G. An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Vol.3.

Gumble, T. Life of General Monck. 1671.

Historical MSS Commission, 11th Report, pt. vi.

Report on the Laing MSS in the
University of Edinburgh.

Hunter, Rev. John. The Diocese and Presbytery of Dunkeld, 1660-1689.

Jaffray, Alexander, Provost of Aberdeen. Diary. (Spalding Club).

Kennet, W. A Register and Chronicle Ecclesiastical and Civil.
Vol.1. 1728.

Kirkton, James. The Secret and True History of the Church of
Scotland. Ed. C.K.Sharpe.

Lamont, John, of Newton, Diary. (Maitland Club).

Lauderdale Papers. Ed. O. Airy. (Royal Historical Society). 3 vols.

Law, Robert. Memorialls. Ed. C.K.Sharpe.

Letters from Roundhead Officers written from Scotland. (Bannatyne
Club).

The Life of Mr. James Sharp from his birth to his instalment in
the archbishoprick of St. Andrews. 1719.

Ludlow's Memoirs. Ed. C.H.Firth.

Macfarlane's Genealogical Collections. Vol.2. (Scottish History
Society.)

Mackenzie, Sir George. Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland.
Ed. T. Thomson.

Nicoll, John. Diary, 1650 - 1667. (Bannatyne Club).

Notes & Queries. 3rd Ser. xii. pp.321-3. Archbishop Sharp of
St. Andrews.

Parliamentary History. Vol.xxii.

Pepys, Samuel. Diary.

Records of the Commissions of the General Assemblies of the
Church of Scotland. Vols. 2 & 3. (Scottish History Society).

Register of the Consultations of the Edinburgh Ministers.
Ed. W. Stephen. 2 vols. (Scottish History Society).

Register of the Privy Council of Scotland. 3rd Ser. Vol.1.

Roll of Alumni in Arts of University and King's College of Aberdeen,
1596 - 1860. (Aberdeen University Studies).

Robertson, A. Life of Sir Robert Moray.

Row, William. Life of Mr. Robert Blair. (Wodrow Society).

Rushworth, J. Historical Collections. Vol. 5. (1708).

Scotland and the Commonwealth. Ed. C.H.Firth. (Scottish History
Society.)

Scotland and the Protectorate. Ed. C.H.Firth. (Scottish History
Society).

Scottish History Society Miscellany, Vol.1. Thirtyfour Letters
written to James Sharp.

Selections from the minutes of the presbyteries of St. Andrews
and Cupar. (Abbotsford Club).

Selections from the minutes of the Synod of Fife. (Abbotsford Club).

Stephen, T. Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp.

Stirton, J. Leaves from my Manuscript Portfolio, pp.19 ff.
The Household Book of James Sharp, Archbishop
of St. Andrews. Privately printed. 1929.

A True and Impartial Account of the Life of Dr. James Sharp,
Archbishop of St. Andrews. 1723.

Walker, Sir E. Historical Discourses. 1705.

Wodrow, R. History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland.
Vol. 1.

Select Biographies. Life of Livingston. (Wodrow Society).

MS Authorities.

National Library of Scotland.

MS. 2512. Letters from James Sharp, Archbishop of St. Andrews, and Alexander Burnet, Archbishop of Glasgow, to the Earl of Lauderdale.

MS MS 597 Papers of the Earl of Lauderdale.

MS 98,f.64. Letters of James Sharp to the Earl of Lauderdale (2).

MS. 32.6.12. Genealogical Collections concerning the name of Baird.

Wodrow MS 8^{vo} xi. (Copies).

Church of Scotland, General Assembly Library. Wodrow MS. (Fol.)
xxvi.

The restoration of Charles II was welcomed with enthusiasm by the Scots with the exception of a few who had compromised themselves too deeply during the late troubles and of the rigid party in the church, who had always openly shown their distrust of the king. The majority party in the church had remained loyal to him throughout the period of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. Their leaders looked to him, as a covenanted king, to confirm the presbyterian government of the kirk of Scotland and to impose presbyterianism on the churches of England and Ireland. They were deeply disappointed when they became aware

I

Introductory -- the ~~Pro~~tester - Resolutioner Controversy.

that the majority of the people of England were hostile to presbyterianism, that a large section of English presbyterians were ready to accept an accommodation which would include them in the Anglican church, and that the king was determined to establish episcopacy in England. When little more than a year after the Restoration it became certain that episcopacy was to be settled in Scotland also, they felt that they had been grievously betrayed. The major part of the blame for this betrayal they laid upon James Sharp, minister of Grail, whom they had sent to London to look after their interests. They felt sure that the king would have acted differently had he understood the true state of feeling in the Scottish church, and they suspected Sharp of having misrepresented the attitude of Scottish ministers.

The restoration of Charles II was welcomed with enthusiasm by the Scots with the exception of a few who had compromised themselves too deeply during the late troubles and of the rigid party in the church, who had always openly shown their distrust of the king. The majority party in the church had remained loyal to him throughout the period of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. Their leaders looked to him, as a covenanted king, to confirm the presbyterian government of the kirk of Scotland and to impose presbyterianism on the churches of England and Ireland. They were deeply disappointed when they became aware that the majority of the people of England were hostile to presbyterianism, that a large section of English presbyterians were ready to accept an accommodation which would include them in the Anglican church, and that the king was determined to establish episcopacy in England. When little more than a year after the Restoration it became certain that episcopacy was to be settled in Scotland also, they felt that they had been grievously betrayed. The major part of the blame for this betrayal they laid upon James Sharp, minister of Crail, whom they had sent to London to look after their interests. They felt sure that the king would have acted differently had he understood the true state of feeling in the Scottish church, and they suspected Sharp of having misrepresented the attitude of Scottish ministers.

The fact that Sharp accepted the archbishopric of St. Andrews gave them ground for their suspicions. He was, doubtless a useful instrument in the hands of those who carried out the change in church government, but he was hardly in a position to influence policy. It seems very improbable that Charles would in any event have made a settlement in accordance with the wishes of the ministers. In his eyes the proceedings by which presbyterianism had been established in Scotland were acts of rebellion, and the Covenants were seditious documents. Charles I had indeed confirmed the Acts of the General Assembly which had abolished episcopacy, set up presbyterian government in the church, and made it compulsory for all to subscribe the National Covenant, but it was contended that he had acted under force in so doing. Moreover by granting to the Scots all they had asked he believed that the had assured that they would observe neutrality towards his quarrel with his English subjects, but the Scots did not keep their part of the bargain. In 1643, when the parliamentary forces were getting the worst of it, they were induced to enter into an alliance with them against the king. By the treaty known as the Solemn League and Covenant both parties agreed to endeavour to preserve the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland against their common enemies, to reform religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland "according to the word of God and the example of the best reformed churches," and to bring the churches in the three kingdoms "to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion,

confession of faith, form of Church government, directory for worship and catechising."¹ No doubt the Scots took this step because they feared that Charles, if he won the victory, would withdraw all his concessions, but Charles had so far kept his word and the fact that they had broken the compact absolved him and his descendants from keeping his agreement with them.

After the death of his father Charles II had himself subscribed both Covenants. He had done so dishonestly without the least intention of keeping them at a time when he was in the greatest straits. The Scots would have him as king, but only as a covenanted king, and Charles yielded to escape an intolerable situation only to find himself in one still more intolerable. He was quite aware that the Scottish commissioners and the Committee of Estates knew very well that he was not sincere in his promises. Some of the commissioners were very much perturbed by this fact, and one of them, Alexander Jaffrey, had begged him not to sign if he could not do so sincerely,² but the majority were only too anxious to get him to subscribe the Covenant in order to have the advantage of fighting for their king against Cromwell and the hated sectaries. When Charles arrived in Scotland he found all power in the hands of the General Assembly, and he never forgot the humiliations which they inflicted upon him and their persecution of his friends and most loyal adherents. Thus when he returned to exile after his escape from Worcester he was filled with hatred

L

² Rushworth, Historical Collections, v., p. 212, (1708).
 Jaffrey's Diary, 32; Life of Livingston, Select Biographies,
 i, 174-5, 179, 180, 183.

of the presbyterians and all their ways and had made up his mind that, if ever he regained his throne, he would never allow them to have such power again.

The moderate and more numerous party had, after the battle of Dunbar, shown their disapproval of the attitude of the extremists and had given the king their support. They remained loyal to him during the Commonwealth and the Protectorate and strongly supported his restoration. He owed them gratitude and might have been expected to make a settlement which would be acceptable to them. The position, however, was not simple. In the ranks of the moderate party, especially in the north, there were many ministers with episcopalian tendencies, while the leaders, holding fast to both Covenants, professed the same principles as the extremists. A free General Assembly would probably have been a scene of controversy and a settlement of differences could not have been brought about without authoritarian interference from outside, which was contrary to Scottish presbyterian principles. The restoration of a moderate episcopacy probably seemed to Charles to be the most effective method of enforcing unity and asserting the authority he was determined to exercise over the church, particularly as the majority of the Scottish nobles, who had resented the power of the General Assembly, as they had formerly resented that of the bishops, were now no longer on the side of the church. It was moreover in accordance with the general opinion of the age that there should be uniformity of religion in the three kingdoms. Both presbyterians and
episcopalians/

episcopalians thought this desirable, and the presbyterians, if they had had the power, would have enforced their system of church government on both England and Ireland.

The great majority of the nation were enthusiastic for the Covenant in 1638, but the methods used to enforce complete unity, although apparently successful at first, produced results which proved dangerous to the settlement. Many ministers were opposed to the Covenant on conscientious grounds, and intimidation was used to compel them to sign it.³ For every minister who gave up his living rather than act against his conscience there must have been several who submitted for the sake of the livelihood of themselves and their families. These men, when differences arose, formed a large section of the moderate party.

Many of the nobility had supported the Covenant for political rather than religious reasons. After the king's final defeat they no longer feared the loss of their church lands, and they had become resentful of the tyranny of the church. Therefore, when the Earls of Lauderdale, Lanark and Loudoun were sent as Commissioners to the Isle of Wight to treat with Charles I and offer that in return for his acceptance of both Covenants the Scots would invade England on his behalf, they agreed to concessions which fell short of these demands and made the treaty known as

3. Baillie, L. & J.i, 62-6, 463-4; Gordon, Scots Affairs,i,45,49-52.

the Engagement. This treaty was accepted by the Committee of Estates but repudiated by the General Assembly, which declared the Engagement to be unlawful and ordered all ministers to preach against it on pain of deprivation. The Estates went on with their preparations, but the determined opposition of the Assembly put such difficulties in the way of raising an army that its defeat was inevitable.

After Cromwell's victory at Preston the Earl of Eglinton and the Earl of Loudoun, who had gone over to the side of the Assembly, led an army from the west to Edinburgh, and supported by Argyll and Cassillis, obtained control of the government. The English army under Lambert marched to Edinburgh in their support. Cromwell followed and met Argyll and Johnston of Warriston in Edinburgh. The result was that the new Committee of Estates, with the approval of the General Assembly, passed the Act of Classes, which excluded from any share in the government or place in the army all who had supported the Engagement.⁴ Thus the majority of the nobility and many of the gentry and burgesses were alienated from the church.

In the ranks of the General Assembly itself there was a measure of opposition. Robert Baillie had serious misgivings, at first regarding the unbending attitude of the Assembly

4. Baillie, L. & J., iii, 31-41; Gardiner, Great Civil War, iv, 228-
A.P.S. vi, Pt. ii. 43. 231

towards Parliament, later about the Act of Classes and the ungrateful treatment of Lauderdale and other nobles whom he believed to be loyal to the Covenant. Robert Blair, minister of St. Andrews, agreed with him on many points, and Robert Douglas, the Moderator, "misliked some men's carriage." Baillie also disapproved of the many depositions of ministers who had preached in favour of the Engagement or refused to preach against it.⁵ For the time being, however, the aims of most members of the Assembly, whether moderates or extremists, were the same -- to maintain what they had so hardly won by the support of both Covenants-- and no serious breach yet took place.

After the execution of Charles I differences again began to be evident. A party in the Assembly led by James Guthrie and Patrick Gillespie were opposed to proclaiming Charles II as king until his adherence to their cause had been proved, and, after his refusal of the offers made by the first commissioners sent to him, they were against sending commissioners again "until a change in the king should appear." After his arrival in Scotland the report of the negotiations brought to the Assembly confirmed the misgivings of the more rigid members. To appease these men the Assembly was induced to demand that Charles should sign the Declaration of Dunfermline, in which he was made to say that he desired to be deeply humbled and afflicted in spirit before God because of his

5. Baillie, L. & J., iii, 91, 92, 97.

father's opposition to the work of reformation and for the idolatry of his mother. When Charles at first refused, the Commission of the Assembly met at the West Kirk of Edinburgh and issued the statement that the kirk and kingdom would not own the King or his interest "otherwayes then with a subordination to God, and so farre as he owns and prosecutes the cause of God, and disclaims his and his father's opposition to the cause of God and to the Covenant, and likewise all the enemies thereof." These proceedings were supported by the Committee of Estates, and Charles, fearing that he would be handed over to the English, signed the Declaration.⁶ The imposition of this humiliation upon the king did not serve its purpose, for the extremists were still unconvinced of his sincerity, and at the time of the Restoration both the Declaration of Dunfermline and the Act of the West Kirk were remembered against the Scottish church, although it was afterwards shown that the latter had been disapproved of by many of the moderates.⁷ With the same object -- to propitiate the extremists -- a committee was appointed which purged the army of many of its best officers and best trained men as **Malignants** who

6. G. A. Records, ii, 460-465, iii, 26-29, 32, 33-40.

7. Robert Douglas was one of those who first went to the king with the Declaration. He was so much impressed by Charles's scruples that he did not press him to sign, and he refused to accompany the ministers appointed to go a second time. His opposition was, however, of no avail, and he yielded to the will of the majority. Wodrow, Hist., i. 47.

8. Laurens's Diary, 23; G. A. Records, iii, 47-48; Balfour, Annals, 102.
 10. It was in connection with this incident that General Middleton was excommunicated by James Guthrie, thus turning him to implacable hostility against presbytery. How, Life of Blair, 242-3.

would bring the curse of God upon the enterprise, an action which contributed to the defeat of Dunbar.⁸ To Cromwell and the English army their victory at Dunbar was the judgement of God in their favour. In the eyes of the rigid covenanters their defeat was due to the hypocrisy of the King in complying with them not for conscience sake but for love of a crown and to the presence of Malignants in the court and the army. Some ministers, on the other hand, among them being the majority of the Synod of Fife, were prepared to support the King in his endeavour to persuade the Assembly that it was necessary to accept the services in the army of those who had been debarred by the Act of Classes. This point of view came to be adopted eventually by both the Committee of Estates and the moderate party in the Assembly, though at first both bodies refused the King's request to that effect, and the Assembly issued a letter of warning to all congregations against complying with either sectaries of malignants.⁹ The Committee of Estates, indeed, urged by the Assembly, proceeded to a thorough purge of the King's household, which resulted in the incident known as "the Start". Charles made an attempt to join the Engagers and Malignants who were in arms in the Highlands, but was followed and overtaken before he had effected his purpose and found it necessary to return.¹⁰ From this time, however, the King

8. Walker, Historical Discourses, 165, 169.

9. Lamont's Diary, 23; G.A. Records, iii.47-58; Balfour, Annals, 108.

10. It was in connection with this incident that General Middleton was excommunicated by James Guthrie, thus turning him to implacable hostility against presbytery. Row, Life of Blair, 244-5.

was treated with greater consideration. He was permitted for the first time on October 10th to sit in the Committee of Estates, and an act of indemnity to the royalists in the north was passed. on October 26th.¹¹

After Duhbar two extremist officers, Strachan and Ker, who had refused to serve under Leslie, had been allowed to raise an army in the western counties, and this army was now the chief hope of the Scots against Cromwell. These officers and their supporters distrusted the King and his advisers, and on their behalf was drawn up the "Humble Petition of the Gentlemen, Officers and Ministers attending the Western Forces", which came to be known as the "Western Remonstrance". It asserted that the King was still "walking in opposition to the work of God and the Covenant", and it urged that he should not be entrusted with the exercise of his power "untill such time as there shall be convincing and clear evidences of a reall change in him." The Committee of Estates declared the Remonstrance to be scandalous and asked the Assembly to agree with them in a resolution that persistence in it was contrary to the laws of the kingdom. Although the majority of the Assembly disapproved of much that was in the Remonstrance, in their desire to maintain unity they decided to

11. Balfour, Annals, iv. 109 - 116, 123, 127-135.

put off taking action in the hope that its promoters might be brought to give such an explanation as would satisfy both church and state. Several of the members present were in sympathy with the Remonstrance and they registered their dissent from this decision, while the framers of the petition could not be got to modify their demands. Thus the cleavage in the ranks of the church became definite, and those who supported the petition were henceforth known as the Remonstrants, or Remonstrators. Their leaders were, among the ministers, James Guthrie and Patrick Gillespie, and, among the members of the Committee of Estates, Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston.^{12.}

During these debates the subjugation of Scotland by the English armies was proceeding. On December 1st Colonel Ker, commander of part of the western army, was defeated and taken prisoner by Lambert, and Colonel Strachan, commander in the southwest, went over to Cromwell, who now held the whole of Scotland south of the Forth. The Commission of the Assembly was by this time willing to discuss the question of admitting Engagers to the army, and on December 14th they replied to a question, which had been put to them by the King and the Committee of Estates, concerning the persons to be employed for the defence of the

12. Gardiner, Commonwealth, i.331-332; G. A. Records, iii.95-106, 131-132; Baillie, L. & J., iii.118-122; Balfour, Annals, iv.169, 173.

kingdom, "In this case of so great and evident necessitie, we cannot be against the raising of all fensible persons in the land, ----- except such/^{as} are excommunicat, forfaulted, notoriously profane, or flagitious, and such as have been from the beginning, and continue still, or are at this tyme obstinat and professed enemies and opposers of the Covenant and Cause of God."¹³ Copies of this resolution were sent to the presbyteries asking for their concurrence. and the replies showed a difference of opinion in the church.

The presbytery of Stirling was the first to take exception to the resolution. They contended that it opened the way for the employment in the army of the majority of the Malignants, even of those who had followed Montrose, and they declared that it was, therefore, inconsistent with the fourth article of the Covenant, which demanded the discovery and bringing to punishment of Malignants, with the Declaration of the General Assembly against the Engagement in 1648, and with their many subsequent Declarations. They pointed out the danger that power might by this means come into the hands of Malignants who would use it for their own ends to the danger of the Covenant and of religion, and they expressed the fear that this step would increase the Lord's wrath and controversy against the land and lead to further misfortunes. They ended by declaring that they could see no justification for employing for

13. Gardiner, Commonwealth, i.343; Baillie, L. & J., iii.125-6; G.A. Records, iii.159.

for the defence of the kingdom those whose principles tended to destroy the cause and protested that kingdom and cause could not be separated. They had a logical case, but the majority in the Assembly, although they could not convince the Remonstrants, could for their part produce excellent arguments and they were able to carry the country with them. They replied that circumstances differed from those of 1648, when the Engagers invaded England on behalf of a king who had not taken the Covenant; Now Scotland, which was supporting a covenanted king, was being invaded by sectaries, who were as dangerous as Malignants. Only such men were to be admitted to the Scottish army as had convinced the church of their sincere repentance and taken the Covenant. They were, therefore, no longer Malignants. The danger arising from allowing them to get power into their hands, if it did exist, was not certain or inevitable, whereas, if the help of all men capable of defending the country were not used, both kingdom and cause would be certainly ruined. ¹⁴ From this time there were two parties in the church, the Public Resolutioners, who had supported the resolution to admit to service in the army all Engagers and Malignants who gave evidence of penitence, and the Remonstrators, who refused to believe in the sincerity of the penitents or of the King. The Resolutioners had commonsense and patriotism on their side, but they cannot be

14. G.A. Records, iii.173-181, 201-214.

acquitted of a measure of hypocrisy, for they knew very well that large numbers of men came forward to express a penitence they did not feel in order that they might be allowed to fight for their country.

The King's coronation took place on January 1st, 1651, and Robert Douglas, the Moderator, one of the leaders of the Public Resolutioners, preached the sermon, in which he spoke very plainly of the duty of a covenanted king. The King now had greater authority, and he set himself to get the army re-organized, while the Assembly Commissioners arranged for examining the penitents who were seeking admission to the army. They also made every effort to win over the Remonstrators, but in this they failed. They, therefore, took measures to prevent ministers and others from speaking and writing against the Public Resolutions on the ground that such behaviour was obstructive to the defence of the King and the kingdom. Meanwhile the King and the Committee of Estates asked the Assembly "whether or not it be sinful and unlawful--to rescind the Act of Classes." The reply was favourable, but it was stipulated that no acts relating to religion and reformation should be repealed, and that assurance should be required from those admitted to the Estates that they would never seek to take revenge on those who had been opposed to their former actions. This condition was accepted, and the act was repealed on June 2nd, 1651.¹⁵ Thus the Commission of the

15. The Form and Order of the King's Coronation, with the Sermon preached on the occasion. 1651.

G.A. Records, iii. 273, 293, 303-4, 351, 353, 403, 420, 439, 444, 459-60, 441, 442, 450, 458-9; A.P.S. vi. Pt. ii. 676-7.

Assembly had practically come round to the royalist point of view.

Such a state of affairs was regarded with horror by the Remonstrants, and, when the new General Assembly met on July 17th, they protested that the members of the late Commission should not be allowed to sit, on the ground that their proceedings had been scandalous. They were, however, in the minority and Robert Douglas was again chosen Moderator. On the 20th there came news of the defeat of the Scottish forces at Inverkeithing and the Assembly was adjourned to Dundee. Before the adjournment took place Samuel Rutherford, Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, gave in a "Protestation against the Assembly and a Declinature from it", signed by twentyeight ministers, and when the Assembly met again at Dundee these ministers were absent. With only seven dissentients the Public Resolutions and the acts of the late Commission were approved, while the Act of the West Kirk was practically repudiated by the passing of a resolution that it was to be interpreted in the sense that the King's interest was to be owned in subordination to God. The leaders of the Remonstrants, now as frequently called the Protesters, James Guthrie, minister of Stirling, Patrick Gillespie, minister of Glasgow, and James Simpson, minister of Airth, were deposed.¹⁶

News of the approach of the English army caused the Assembly to close. A few weeks later, on August 28th, while

16. G.A. Records, iii.495; Row, Life of Blair, 277, 278.

Dundee was being besieged, a party of English soldiers surprised at Alyth the Committee of Estates, who were attended by Robert Douglas, James Sharp and other leading Resolutioners. All were shipped from Broughty Ferry to London and lodged in the Tower.¹⁷ The King, having broken with Argyll, who had retired to the Highlands, was now invading England. After his defeat at Worcester on September 3rd Scotland was soon completely conquered by the English. General Assemblies were forbidden, though synods, presbyteries and kirk sessions were allowed to meet. The church was kept in strict subordination to the state and toleration to all but catholics and prelatists was insisted upon.

Although the reason for the controversy between Resolutioners and Protesters no longer existed it still continued to rage with the utmost bitterness. There were frequent disputes in the church courts. Where the Protesters were numerous they sometimes formed separate courts. Where they were in the majority they sometimes deposed ministers who had different views from their own, and they even forced ministers upon congregations in opposition to their wishes.¹⁸ All efforts for union failed, and even Cromwell found it impossible to mediate between the two parties. At the Restoration the breach was as wide as ever, and its existence undoubtedly assisted the restoration of episcopacy.

17. Scotland and the Commonwealth, 9; Row, Life of Blair, 281;

18. Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of Edinburgh,
1. pp.xvi-xvii.

James Sharp began to take an active part in General Assembly politics about the time of the battle of Dunbar. As might be expected from his connections and early upbringing, he attached himself to the moderate party. Born in the castle of Banff in the episcopate north on May 4th, 1618, he was one of the three sons of William Sharp, agent of the Earl of Findlater, and Sheriff Clerk of Banffshire, and his wife Isobel, daughter of John Leslie of Kipinvie, a connection of the Earl of Rothes. He became a student of King's College, Aberdeen, in 1633 and graduated M.A. in 1637. He, then, according to his episcopalian biographer, studied Theology under Dr. John Forbes and Dr. Robert Baron, two

James Sharp and the Resolutioners -- Mission to Cromwell. and it is probable enough that it was owing to the disturbances connected with the Covenant that Sharp went to England, where he remained for three or four years. He is said to have visited Oxford and Cambridge, to have made the acquaintance of Jeremy Taylor, and to have intended to take Anglican orders and seek an English benefice. If he had any such purpose it became impossible owing to the outbreak of the civil war and the abolition of episcopacy in England. Partly for this reason, it is related, and partly owing to an illness Sharp decided to return to Scotland, where he conformed to presbytery.

1. Annals of Banff, ii.333m; Macfarlane's Genealogical Collections, ii.48; Roll of Alumni in Arts of the University and King's Colleges, Aberdeen, 12; True Account of the life of James Sharp, 28-30. This biography, published in 1723, was written by an episcopalian who claimed that it was based on information given by Sharp's relatives and friends. Another life, by a Covenanter, was published in 1719 and said to have been written during his lifetime -- Life of Mr. James Sharp from his birth to his installation in the Archbishopric of St. Andrews.

James Sharp began to take an active part in General Assembly politics about the time of the battle of Dunbar. As might be expected from his connections and early upbringing, he attached himself to the moderate party. Born in the castle of Banff in the episcopal north on May 4th, 1618, he was one of the three sons of William Sharp, agent of the Earl of Findlater, and Sheriff Clerk of Banffshire, and his wife Isobel, daughter of John Leslie of Kininvie, a connection of the Earl of Rothes. He became a student of King's College, Aberdeen, in 1633 and graduated M.A. in 1637. He, then, according to his episcopalian biographer, studied Theology under Dr. John Forbes and Dr. Robert Baron, two of the Aberdeen doctors who refused to take the Covenant; and it is probable enough that it was owing to the disturbances connected with the Covenant that Sharp went to England, where he remained for three or four years. He is said to have visited Oxford and Cambridge, to have made the acquaintance of Jeremy Taylor, and to have intended to take Anglican orders and seek an English benefice. If he had any such purpose it became impossible owing to the outbreak of the civil war and the abolition of episcopacy in England. Partly for this reason, it is related, and partly owing to an illness Sharp decided to return to Scotland, where he conformed to presbytery,¹

-
1. Annals of Banff, ii.333n; Macfarlane's Genealogical Collections, ii.48; Roll of Alumni in Arts of the University and King's Colleges, Aberdeen, 12; True Account of the life of James Sharp, 28-30. This biography, published in 1723, was written by an episcopalian who claimed that it was based on information given by Sharp's relatives and friends. Another life, by a Covenanter, was published in 1719 and said to have been written during his lifetime -- Life of Mr. James Sharp from his birth to his Instalment in the Archbishoprick of St. Andrews.

which was now the religion established by law, since Charles I had accepted the National Covenant and consented to the abolition of episcopacy.

In the early part of 1643 Sharp was appointed Regent in St. Leonard's College², ^{St. Andrews.} He had among his colleagues Samuel Rutherford, Principal of St. Mary's College, later one of the leaders of the Protesters, who is said even at this time to have disapproved of Sharp, and James Wood, Third Master of St. Mary's College, later one of the leading Resolutioners, who remained on terms of close friendship with Sharp until the restoration of episcopacy caused a breach between them. At St. Andrews also were Robert Blair, minister of the first charge, Rutherford's friend, who wished to mediate between the two parties, and Andrew Honyman, recently appointed to be minister of the second charge³ (later Bishop of Orkney). Sharp seems to have been an excellent teacher and to have attracted to his lectures many students of considerable attainments.⁴ Shortly after he received this appointment the Solemn League and Covenant became the law of the land and in order to retain his position he must have subscribed it.

Sharp remained at St. Andrews for about five years. At the beginning of November 1647 the Earl of Crawford-Lindsay, patron of Crail, presented him to be minister of that church, and, after

2. Notes & Queries, 3rd Ser. xii.321; True Account, p.30; Life of James Sharp, 21

3. Fasti, vii.354.

4. Life of James Sharp, 37.

undergoing his trials "with some commendation", he was admitted on January 27th, 1648.⁵ During the first year of his charge occurred all the excitement over the Engagement. Whatever may have been his private opinion Sharp must have conformed outwardly to the prevailing view of the Assembly and warned his parishioners not to take part in it, for strong action was taken by the presbytery of St. Andrews against all ministers who did not oppose it.⁶ He seems very quickly to have won recognition as an able minister, for, in 1649 the General Assembly was asked to permit his transportation to Edinburgh. The people of Crail did not wish to part with their minister, and, supported by Sharp himself, they petitioned against the transportation, which was refused by the Assembly in November 1649. The town of Edinburgh, however, renewed the application. It was referred to the following General Assembly by the Synod of Fife and granted, it is said, on July 10, 1650, but, owing to Cromwell's invasion of Scotland, the transportation did not take effect, and Sharp remained minister of Crail until after the Restoration.⁷

In the previous June Sharp, James Wood and Robert Blair had been appointed Commissioners for the General Assembly by the Presbytery of St. Andrews.⁸ On July 16th the Assembly chose the

5. Ibid.39; Selections from the Minutes of the Presbyteries of St. Andrews and Cupar, n37-8.

6. Ibid.44-48.

7. G6A.Records, ii.310; Lamont's Diary, 11,14,22.

8. ibid.19.

Commission which was to look after the affairs of the church while the Assembly was not in session, and the three members of the Presbytery of St. Andrews were among the number. The first meeting of the Commission took place on July 24th and Robert Douglas was chosen as Moderator.⁹ Sharp's first appearance was at the meeting of 12th September, nine days after the defeat of Dunbar, and from that date he attended with great regularity and served on innumerable committees.¹⁰ He was often asked to confer with prominent royalists who were professing penitence and seeking admission to the army,¹¹ he was very frequently appointed with others to meet and attempt to give satisfaction to ministers who opposed the Public Resolutions and was a member of many committees dealing with that matter.¹² Thus he must have become thoroughly acquainted with the arguments on both sides, and doubtless he then acquired the complete mastery of the case for the Resolutioners which resulted in his missions to London.

He was one of the ministers captured at Alyth with the Committee of Estates on August 28th, 1651, and sent to the Tower of London.¹³ The first to be set at liberty was George Patullo, who returned to Scotland in March 1652.¹⁴ Sharp was the next to be

9. G.A. Records,^{iii.} 4-5, 7.

10. Ibid. 52 & passim.

11. Ibid. 171 & passim.

12. Ibid. 259, 273, 293, 307, 339, 406, 420, 430, 444; Row, Life of Blair, 257.

13. Ibid. 281; Scotland and the Commonwealth, 9; Baillie, L. & J., 563; Lamont's Diary, 34.

14. Ibid. 34.

released . He was required to remain in London during the following two months, and doubtless he improved the time by becoming acquainted with the leading presbyterians of the City and learning all he could of the situation there.¹⁵ About the middle of June leave was given to him to return to Scotland.¹⁵ The discharge of the remaining seven ministers was ordered on November 30th. Three were allowed to return home in January 1653, but Robert Douglas, John Smith, James Hamilton and Andrew Ker were not/^{released} until March.¹⁶ In later years, when Sharp had fallen into ill odour with his former colleagues, he was accused of ignoble submission to Cromwell's government, but no such charge was brought against him at the time.

Sharp was not a member of the Commission of the Assembly which was renewed on August 5th, and of which David Dickson, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, was elected Moderator.¹⁸ When, however, on November 27th it was decided to hold a conference with the Protesters, Sharp was named with Robert Blair, James Wood, David Forret, Andrew Honyman and the Moderator to meet their representatives at St. Andrews in January 1653, and on 30th May

-
16. On April 8th, 1652, the Council of State ordered that Sharp should be bailed on giving security not to go out of the City and to be of good behaviour. On June 17th orders were given that he should be allowed to return to Scotland on condition of rendering himself to Major General Deane on his arrival, and on July 1st that on coming to Edinburgh he should render himself to the Governor of Leith in the absence of Major General Deane. C.S.P.D., 1651-2, pp. 213, 296, 312.
15. Cf. Reg. Consult. i. 213, Row's Blair, 328.
17. C.S.P.D., 1651-2, p. 515; Row's Blair, 304, Lamont's Diary, 34.
18. GA. Records, iii. 519

the same ministers were again named to continue the conference,¹⁹ but as before there was no result. In the following July the General Assembly, which met at Edinburgh, was dispersed by order of Colonel Lilburne, who suspected the ministers of encouraging the rising in the Highlands under the Earl of Glencairn.²⁰ After this date the Assembly was not allowed to meet again, but certain of the Resolutioners, the ministers of Edinburgh and some other of the leading ministers, used to meet at Edinburgh from time to time for consultation, and records of their proceedings were kept.²¹

It was not easy for Cromwell to decide how to deal with the Scottish church, which he wished to conciliate, realising doubtless that ministers had great influence with their congregations. The Protesters were believed to be more likely to respond to the advances of the English government, and in 1653 the Commissioners for Universities and Churches had appointed Patrick Gillespie as Principal of Glasgow University, against the will of the College and much to the indignation of Robert Baillie, Professor of Divinity there.²² Although Gillespie accepted the position, the Protesters generally showed themselves to be as much averse from government interference as were the Resolutioners. Anxious to restore order in the church Cromwell summoned six ministers to

19. Ibid. 535-6, 556.

20. Scotland and the Commonwealth, 162-3.

21. Reg. Consult. i. 70.

22. Baillie, L. & J., iii. 212-3.

repair to London to discuss the matter. Three of them, Robert Douglas, Robert Blair and James Guthrie, refused to go for various reasons, while Patrick Gillespie, John Livingstone and John Menzies made the required journey. Finding the differences irreconcilable Cromwell issued an ordinance, dated 8th August 1654, which made provision for the filling of vacant livings, one of the chief subjects of dispute. This ordinance was brought back to Scotland by Gillespie and came to be known as "Gillespie's charter". It was rejected by the leaders of both parties as contrary to the constitution of the church, and the Resolutioners believed that Gillespie had suggested the plan to Cromwell in the hope of obtaining the control of the church for the Protesters. Thus it only widened the existing breach. It never became effective, for the persons nominated to administer it refused to act. The Council was, therefore, bidden to see that the vacancies were filled by ministers "of a holy and unblamable conversation." ²³

When Lord Broghill became President of the Council of Scotland in September 1655 he set himself seriously to reconcile the ministers to the rule of Cromwell. He was himself a presbyterian and thus had some understanding of the presbyterian point of view. He found Sharp very helpful and reasonable and formed a friendship with him which proved very useful to the Resolutioners. ²⁴

23. Reg. Consult.i.70-71; Scotland and the Protectorate, 57,102;211; Nicoll's Diary,127; Baillie, L. & J.,iii.243; Letters from Roundhead Officers,101,105; A.P.S.vi.Pt.ii.830-1.

24. Baillie, L. & J.,iii.315.

He reported to Cromwell that the Resolutioners were the stronger party, that the six leaders were Robert Douglas, David Dickson, James wood, George Hutcheson, John Smith and James Sharp, that they had assured ^{him} they could speak for 750 of the 900 parish ministers of the country, and that they were willing to promise to live peaceably under Cromwell's government, to cease praying for the King, and to persuade their followers to do the same. Douglas, whom he regarded as the leading minister of the whole church, had admitted that a General Assembly was not at that time expedient. He expected also to win over Gillespie and Livingstone, whom he found more moderate than Guthrie and Warriston, and he hoped to get them to unite with the Resolutioners. His influence led to another conference between the two parties, but it failed to bring about the desired union. In one of his aims, however, Broghill was successful. In October 1655 the Resolutioners formally decided to cease praying for the King. Nevertheless, without mentioning the word "king", they continued to pray for him in vague terms which were well understood by intelligent members of their congregations.²⁵

After the failure of the conference both parties made representations to the Council of Scotland putting forward their respective claims to exercise authority over the church, but nothing was then done in the matter. In August 1656 the Resolutioners

25. A.P.S.vi.Pt.ii.pp.899-900; Reg.Consult.,i.89,90; Nicoll's Diary,160-1; Lamont's Diary,93; Scotland and the Protectorate, 321.

hearing that the Protesters were intending to send representatives to Cromwell, decided to send James Sharp to London to prevent any mischief by misrepresentation. Sharp is said to have been chosen because of his friendship with Broghill and his acquaintance with some of the English judges and some men in London. The Protesters sent James Simpson as their representative. He arrived in October and in January 1657 he was followed by Guthrie, Gillespie, Johnston of Warriston and Sir Andrew Ker of Greenhead.²⁶

Sharp was instructed to defend the Resolutioners against the aspersions of the Protesters, to ask that the ordinance of 1654 relating to the appointment of ministers should be recalled, and that the church should be allowed to carry on its government as it was established by acts of General Assemblies and Acts of Parliaments. If, however, any suggestion should be made for calling a General Assembly, he was to represent that such a step was inexpedient at the time owing to the differences in the church. Sharp spent the early part of his time in London interviewing all who were likely to have influence with the Protector, and the Protesters, on their arrival, followed his example. They had friends among men in the highest positions, among them Lambert and Fleetwood. Monck also favoured them, while Broghill supported the Resolutioners. Among Scotsmen in London the Marquis of Argyll was a friend of the Protesters and the Earl of Tweeddale also seems to have been on

26. Reg. Consult., i. 191-3, 204, 221, 268; Baillie, L. & J., iii. 324, 327-331; Row's Blair, 328.

their side. Andrew Ramsay, Provost of Edinburgh, was the only Scot who gave Sharp effectual help.²⁷

The Protector held conferences with both parties. At first he was inclined to favour the Protesters, but he was impressed by Sharp's arguments. However, he got little help from either side towards reaching a decision. The matter was put off for some time; then a committee for dealing with it was appointed in July. The protesters put forward their proposals, to which Sharp stated the objections from the point of view of the Resolutioners. The Committee's report was in favour of the Protesters, but by the ability and clearness with which he put forward his arguments Sharp had won influential supporters, among them Secretary Thurloe, who formed a high opinion of him. Monck also had by this time changed his opinion of the Protesters, and writing to Cromwell on church matters had much to say in favour of the Resolutioners. Eventually in September 1657 the Council, in the presence of Cromwell, resolved not to interfere in the differences of the Scottish church, but to leave them to the exercise of their established government. Following this decision a letter was sent in the Protector's name to representatives of both parties in Edinburgh advising them to meet

27. Scotland & the Protectorate, 345; Wodrow MSS, Fol. xxvi.77 (C. of Reg. Consult. ii.43,44. S²)

Argyll was in London on business relating to his private affairs (D.N.B. - Article on Archibald, 8th Earl and also Marquis of Argyll). Tweeddale and Ramsay sat in the Commonwealth parliament as members for East Lothian and Edinburgh respectively. Ramsay was Lord Provost of Edinburgh, an office to which he was again elected after the Restoration. He remained a friend of Sharp to the end of his life. The Cromwellian Union, pp. lxii; S.H.S. Misc. i.253.

as brethren and reconcile their differences.²⁸

Early in October Sharp had a farewell interview with Cromwell, and, having decided to remain in the south till Lord Broghill should return to London, he occupied himself while waiting by visiting Oxford and its neighbourhood to make the acquaintance of various well known and influential presbyterians, among them Richard Baxter at Kidderminster, to whom he took a letter of recommendation from the Earl of Lauderdale, dated 19th October.²⁹ At this time Lauderdale, the Earl of Crawford Lindsay and Lord Sinclair were prisoners at Windsor Castle. Crawford Lindsay had been a member of the Committee of Estates taken at Alyth and Lauderdale had been made prisoner at Worcester. Both had been in the Tower at the same time as Sharp and the other ministers and had since been transferred to Windsor. The Protesters had visited them early in April and had not had a very good reception. Sharp had not been able to go at that time, but he was in touch with Lauderdale, through Patrick Drummond, a young Scottish presbyterian minister, resident in London, and a cordial exchange of letters between Sharp and Lauderdale took place.³⁰ Sharp visited Lauderdale later, and the letter which he carried was the first of a regular correspondence between Lauderdale and Baxter. It shows that Lauderdale and Sharp, in addition to discussing church politics, had talked over their reading and expressed a common admiration for Baxter's works. Lauderdale had found in several passages

28. Reg. Consult. i.358,ii.91,123,125 126; C.S.P.D.,1657-8,pp.89-

90.

29. Reg. Consult. ii.128-9; John Rylands Library, Bulletin, vii.81.

30. Reg. Consult. ii.35-6,37-8.

expressions of sympathy with the unfortunate condition of the Church of Scotland, and he hoped that Baxter might be convinced of the justice of the Resolutioners' position and be helpful in influencing other divines, a meeting of whom was expected to be called during the next session of parliament.³¹

Sharp was back in London by November 12th, but he did not set out for Scotland until December 9th. Before leaving London he had arranged that Major Robert Beake should look after the Resolutioners' interests there. He made his report to the ^{ministers} Edinburgh at the beginning of January, and was thanked for his "unwearied labours and diligence in his employment." A letter from two leading London ministers, Edmund Calamy and Simeon Ashe, to the ministers of Edinburgh, praising Sharp's conduct of his trust, was read and put on record. The actual result of Sharp's efforts was that the Protesters had failed to obtain the support of Cromwell in their attempt to dominate the church and the two parties were bidden after their return home to seek reconciliation and carry on the work of reformation together. To show that they were willing to carry out this injunction the Resolutioners drew up "A Declaration-----expressing their earnest desires of union and peace with their Dissenting Brethren." As the essential condition of union was that the Protesters should agree to submit to the established government of the church and accept the decisions of

31. Ibid. 129; John Rylands Library, Bulletin, vii.81.

nothing came of this overture. merely
 the majority in church judicatories, / It/called forth from the
 Protesters a reply entitled "Protesters no subverters", and so the
 war of pamphlets continued.³²

Sharp must hve been glad to return to his charge at Crail
 after his strenuous labours. He doubtless continued to attend the
 the meetings of the brethren for consultation at Edinburgh and to
 give his advice and help in all matters connected with the contro-
 versy. He wrote from Crail to Patrick Drummond on 28th August
 giving him messages to the London ministers regarding the Protesters'
 pamphlet. He was visiting his home at Banff in September when he
 received the news of the death of the Protector and a summons to
 return to Edinburgh. From Banff he wrote to Sir James Baird of
 Auchmeddan apologising for not having been able to call upon him
 because of the necessity of his sudden departure and expressing the
 view that "this juncture of time looks very cloudy, and is like to
 be very ticklish."³³

The ministers of the moderate party no doubt shared Sharp's
 opinion and watched the situation in England with anxiety. At a
 meeting in November of the Edinburgh ministers and correspondents
 from the presbyteries it was decided to give power to the ministers
 of Edinburgh with any others they could conveniently meet with to
 send an agent to London to carry on Sharp's work. A new parliament

32. Reg. Consult. ii.129,130-1,131-6,142,143,146,147; Baillie,
L. & J.iii.362; L.P.i.3.

33. Ibid. N.L.S. Ms. 32.6.12. (Genealogical Collections concern-
 in g ~~the~~ name of Baird, p.173.)

was elected to meet in London at the end of January. Argyll was a member of the House of Commons and Warriston of the Peers. Hearing that Warriston had gone to London and that some other Protesters were to follow the Edinburgh ministers urgently begged Sharp to undertake the mission, which with considerable reluctance he agreed to do. His previous instructions were renewed, and he was further directed to make representations against the toleration introduced in accordance with the Humble Petition and Advice, by means of which "a door is opened to very many gross errors and loose practises in this church."³⁴

He arrived in London on February 19th and on Monday, the 21st, visited the Earls of Lauderdale and Crawford at Windsor. He then had interviews with his former acquaintances and supporters. The Secretary, Thurloe, introduced him to Richard Cromwell, who received him cordially and impressed him favourably. He reported that Richard Cromwell favoured the presbyterians, but the officers of the army and the republicans were on the side of the Independents, who were very strong in England and were likely to support the Protesters. He remarked incidentally that Sir Harry Vane had jeered at the Solemn League and Covenant as an "Almanac out of date," but Vane himself, he added, was "like to be out of fashion."³⁵

34. Row's Blair, 335; Reg. Consult. ii. 147 - 152; The Cromwellian Union, pp. lxviii, lxix, lxx.

35. Reg. Consult., ii. 151, 153, 155-6; Wodrow Mss Fol. xxvi. 88. (C. of S.)

The House of Commons was discussing the Humble Petition and Advice, the constitution under which it met. The question of Scottish representation and religious questions such as church government, toleration and the observation of a fast were also raised in both Houses. Sharp wrote full and disapproving accounts of the contributions of Argyll and Warriston to the discussions, as reported to him by his friends in the House. The dissolution of parliament on April 22nd put an end to these debates, and Sharp wrote to Douglas on the 23rd that there was no need for Scotsmen to stay longer and he expected permission to return home. Douglas, however, asked him to remain until matters were settled, and his friends in the House and the presbyterian ministers in the City gave the same advice. On May 7th Sharp reported the dissolution of the Rump and that it had declared "the government to be without a single person in the way of a free state". He thought that he could now do no more by staying in London, as parliament would be too busy with the affairs of England to meddle in church matters, and, if they did, he would not be in a position to exert any influence. He added that the Protesters now thought they had the ball at their feet. Douglas wrote on the 9th agreeing that he should return home and he received the letter on the 12th, when he wrote that a parliament and Council of State had been chosen and that Warriston had been nominated as a member of the Council of State.³⁶

³⁶. The Cromwellian Union, pp.lxxx-lxxxviii.; Reg.Consult.ii.160-1, 163-7,171,174-6,178-80.

Sharp was, however, to remain in London against his will until the beginning of July. As early as April 28th he had been warned that it would be well for him to keep out of the way, since he was looked upon as a promoter of the presbyterian interest, which was regarded as equivalent to that of the cavaliers "in a refined form," but he had despised the suggestion. On May 23rd the Council issued an order for his seizure and examination along with five others including the well known royalist agents, Colonel Massey and Captain Titus, and Sharp received an order requesting him to attend the Council with all speed. He was examined by Sir Harry Vane and Mr. Thomas Scott and questioned about his acquaintance with members of the late parliament and among the ministers in the City, his visits to Windsor, his connection with Lord Broghill and an alleged conversation with Massey and Titus. He denied any acquaintance with the two last and stated that since coming to London he had been concerned only with ecclesiastical affairs. Asked when he intended to return to Scotland, he replied that he would go on the next day, if the Council would give him a pass. Vane and Scott then made their report to the Council and returned with the message that he was to remain about the City for a little while until the Council gave notice of their further pleasure. He reported to Douglas that he had been able to carry himself "with much composure and freedom of mind", and that his interrogators had treated him with great civility and had professed themselves satisfied. He was afterwards informed by friends that

that the Council intended no disadvantage to him, but they wished him to remain because they were about to do something concerning Scotland.³⁷

Later Sharp wrote that his examination was due to a plot on the part of the Protesters, who wished to discredit the Resolutioners in the eyes of the new government. At the time of his last visit to Windsor there had been rumours of a plot in the City and his visit had been reported as suspicious. Warriston also had told the Council that Sharp had had private meetings with Massey and Titus. It had been moved that he should be imprisoned, but Warriston had opposed this for the reason that it would put the ministry and most of Scotland about their ears. So Sharp was only examined and ordered to be detained as it was considered undesirable that one of his influence in Scotland should go there.³⁸

On June 29th he was surprised to receive an order for his return in the following terms:-- "Ordered that Mr. James Sharp be commandit furthwith to retorne out of England to his own habitation in Scotland and there apply himself to the duty of his calling within his parish and other his own privat affairs, and that he doe not intermeddle with any matters that relate to the publict affairs or concerns of these nations, either himself or by negotiating or corresponding with others therein, but quyetyly and peaceably demeane himself and keep within the compass of his own calling."

37. Reg. Consult., ii.176,181-5; C.S.P.D.1658-9, pp.352,353.

38. Reg. Consult., ii.190.

The terms of the order and its unexpected arrival at that time required an explanation. Sharp received the information that it was due to Gillespie, who intended to stay longer in London and wished to get rid of him. He had, therefore, contrived that the order should be moved when those who knew Sharp and had had his own account of his actions were absent. When this fact became known some members of the Council expressed their dissatisfaction. Sharp was, however, advised by his friends not to take any steps in the matter, but to return home by the first opportunity. He wrote that he had engaged a seat in the coach for York which was to leave on Wednesday, July 6th, from there he would take horse and he expected to be in Edinburgh by the 15th. After his return he gave an account of his proceedings and was approved for his faithfulness, diligence and prudence.³⁹

Sharp's colleagues accepted without hesitation his assurance that he had not been interfering in matters unconnected with his mission.⁴⁰ Nevertheless there may have been some grounds for the suspicions against him, for a general rising of cavaliers and presbyterians was being planned, and Lauderdale, Crawford Lindsay and Sinclair were probably aware of it. Sharp had been seeing them frequently, and it seems likely that he would take messages from them to the Scottish nobility. It is certain that soon after this he was in the confidence of the Earl of Rothes,

39. Ibid.ii.192.

40. Ibid.ii.186.

(whose home was in the east nook of Fife, in which the parish of Crail was situated) and other presbyterian nobles.⁴¹

-
41. On April 6th, 1660, when the king's restoration was being confidently expected, Lauderdale and Sharp were both in London. Rothes wrote to Lauderdale hoping that Sharp had given him a full account of all they had done in Scotland on the king's behalf, and again on April 18th, when he believed that Lauderdale was about to go to Breda to the king, he advised him to keep Sharp with him, adding that he wished all his brethren were like him, for, though he honoured the others as ministers, Sharp was not to be compared with them. L.P., I.10,17. Probably Sharp had commended himself to the nobles by a more broadminded attitude to affairs than that of the other ministers and had won their respect by his political acumen.

Sharp's mission to General Monk.

During the August following Sharp's return to Scotland there took place the rebellion in Cheshire of Cavaliers and presbyterians under Sir George Booth which was suppressed by Lambert. The plans for risings in other parts of the country had been abortive and Monck had taken care that Scotland should not take part. At the end of July he had asked those whom he knew to be strongly royalist in sympathy to sign an agreement not to take part in any movement on behalf of Charles Stuart and had imprisoned those who refused to sign. Among the first signatories

III

were the Marls of Glencairn and Rothes and some of those imprisoned soon Sharp's mission to General Monck. evidently realized that the time was not yet ripe.

Monck was now on excellent terms with the Revolutionist party, who carried on their duties peacefully under his rule. He allowed no General Assembly to be held, but they did not regret this owing to the divisions in the church, and their chief stumbling-block was that he continued to insist on toleration for sectarians. The nation as a whole seems to have had great respect for him, and when Lambert, after defeating Booth and his followers, suppressed the Hamp parliament Monck was able to rely upon Scottish support for his decision to maintain the rights of parliament against the party in favour of military rule.

1. Clarke Papers.iv.pp.ix.35.41.

During the August following Sharp's return to Scotland there took place the rebellion in Cheshire of Cavaliers and presbyterians under Sir George Booth which was suppressed by Lambert. The plans for risings in other parts of the country had been abortive and Monck had taken care that Scotland should not take part. At the end of July he had asked those whom he knew to be strongly royalist in sympathy to sign an agreement not to take part in any movement on behalf of Charles Stuart and had imprisoned those who refused to sign. Among the first signatories were the Earls of Glencairn and Rothes and some of those imprisoned soon followed their example.¹ They had evidently realised that the time was not yet ripe.

Monck was now on excellent terms with the Resolutioner party, who carried on their duties peacefully under his rule. He allowed no General Assembly to be held, but they did not regret this owing to the divisions in the church, and their chief stumbling-block was that he continued to insist on toleration for sectaries. The nation as a whole seems to have had great respect for him, and when Lambert, after defeating Booth and his followers, suppressed the Rump parliament Monck was able to rely upon Scottish support for his decision to maintain the rights of parliament against the party in favour of military rule.

1. Clarke Papers, iv. pp. ix, 25, 41.

As soon as he heard of Lambeth's action Monck took steps to counter it by making sure of the garrisons of Berwick and Carlisle. On October 27th he summoned Commissioners from the shires and burghs of Scotland to meet him at Edinburgh on November 15th,² when the royalist Earl of Glencairn was chosen president of the nobles and Sir James Stuart president of the burghs. Monck informed them that he had a call from God to march into England to assert and maintain the liberty of parliaments, that he expected them to keep peace in Scotland during his absence, to hold no correspondence with any of Charles Stuart's adherents, to countenance and encourage the godly ministry and to continue faithfully to own and assert the interest of parliamentary government. A favourable reply was given the following day and a further meeting was held on December 13th, when arrangements for keeping the peace were finally made, the noblemen, gentlemen and justices of the peace entrusted with this duty in each county being required to give a written undertaking to live peaceably and to do nothing to the prejudice of the commonwealth of England or in favour of the interests of Charles Stuart. This undertaking was readily given by the

2. Ibid. 64-6, 78; Annals of Banff, i. 141. Robert Sharp, Sheriff Clerk of Banffshire, brother of James Sharp, was chosen Commissioner for the burgh of Banff.

majority, who doubtless expected that the movement would end in the restoration of the king. Monck, however, still maintained the English garrisons in Scotland, and he refused to allow the Scots to be armed, as he feared that this would arouse the suspicion that he was really in favour of the cavalier interest.³

The ministers of the Resolutioner party were willing to give him all possible help and encouragement. Before he left Scotland he had several conversations with Robert Douglas, who urged upon him the necessity of a free parliament to settle the future government. Douglas had too much discretion to declare his opinion on the nature of the government which should be set up, and Monck later professed to believe that the Scottish presbyterians were indifferent to the form of the civil government provided that the presbyterian form of church government was established. This was a misunderstanding, as the ministers held fast to the Solemn League and Covenant, which involved support of the king.⁴

Sharp also was in Monck's confidence. Lord Broghill had found him helpful when he was trying to reconcile the ministers to the rule of Cromwell, and doubtless Monck had found him useful in a similar way. He probably now considered that his wide

3. Clarke Papers, iv.113-116, 190-1, 194-5; Baillie, L. & J., iii.439.

4. Ibid. iii.585; Wodrow, Hist. i.6, 10; Reg.Consult. ii.197.

acquaintance among presbyterians in both England and Scotland and his reasonable and moderate outlook would make him a valuable helper in a movement which required the co-operation of men of differing views on religion. His first service was to write to Lauderdale at Windsor that Monck would be for a good parliament. Lauderdale then wrote to the city ministers, Calamy, Ash and Taylor, and to Oxford and elsewhere, and this was later reported by Ash to have caused the first addresses from the City and counties to Monck for a free parliament. Monck left Berwick for Coldstream on December 8th, and Sharp was with him there for some time. He is said to have been summoned to go there by Monck in order to draft the declaration which, read at the head of Monck's army the next morning and spread over the country, caused half Lambert's men to desert. But Monck's chaplain, Gumble, seems to have known nothing of this, for he makes no mention of it, although he relates that among the "worthy gentlemen of the Scotch nation" who resorted to Coldstream was "His Grace of St. Andrews, who was a person so watchful for the good of the Kirk of Scotland that he was but seldom from the Headquarters."⁵

Sharp did not accompany Monck on his march from Coldstream, but Monck soon decided that he needed his help, and he had a letter written to him from York on January 15th asking him "to

5. Wodrow, Hist., i.8; True Account, pp.xiv-xv; Gumble, Life of Monck, 179.

undertake a winter journey, and come to him at London with all speed. He would be told the reasons on his arrival, and he was to inform none but Douglas, since Monck desired that his going should not be made too public. The Resolutioners had before this decided to send Sharp to London to advise Monck on church matters and to keep themselves informed about the course of events, and Dickson and Douglas had written to Monck on January 10th, asking for a pass for Sharp in view of his treatment by the parliament at the end of his former mission. This letter reached Monck on the morning of January 16th, when he was about to leave York, and he wrote personally the same day from Ferrybridge to Dickson and Douglas sending the pass and assuring them of his care for the welfare of their church.⁶

Thus Sharp went to London as the agent of both Monck and the Resolutioners, and since Monck, although he professed to be a presbyterian, did not see eye to eye with the Scottish ministers on religious matters, it might have been foreseen that Sharp would soon find himself in an equivocal position. Monck's presbyterianism was not founded upon the ~~any~~ conviction of the divine right of presbytery. It was the religion of a practical man who at that time was of opinion that presbytery was the form of church government best suited to the English as well as to the Scottish nation. He expressed the belief that the English would not endure prelacy.

6. Wodrow, Hist., i.4-5.

At the same time many of the soldiers in his army, on whom he must rely for success, were sectaries, and the Rump, of which he was the servant, was republican and in sympathy with the sectaries. Monck, therefore, advocated "liberty for tender consciences", the "lax toleration" which was anathema to the Scottish presbyterians. It is practically certain that Monck himself had subscribed the Solemn League and Covenant when he entered the service of the Long Parliament in 1646, for it was an essential condition of that service, but he had probably done so reluctantly in order to secure release from imprisonment and that he might be able to take part in the essential work of putting down rebellion in Ireland.⁷ He would certainly not be willing to enforce the Covenant on those who were conscientiously opposed to it.

To the Scottish ministers conscientious opposition to the Covenant was unthinkable. The Solemn League and Covenant was the foundation of their policy. They believed that both the English and Scottish nations were bound to maintain it by the oath of God and that, if they failed to do so, they were in danger of further judgements. They ignored the fact that the religious clause of the Covenant was drawn up in general terms of which different interpretations were possible. They believed that it meant that England should accept presbytery as it was practised in Scotland. In their instructions to Sharp no mention was made of it, as it

7. Firth, C.H. Article on Monck in D.N.B.

was taken for granted. As formerly, he was to endeavour that the kirk of Scotland should enjoy her established judicatures and to represent the sinfulness of the lax toleration then established. Douglas also gave Sharp verbal instructions to speak to Monck with a view to the release from their prison in Windsor Castle of Lauderdale, Crawford Lindsay and Sinclair.⁸ It was Douglas's policy to rely on the support of the leading Scottish presbyterian nobles,⁹ in harmony with whom his party had worked from the time of the Public Resolutions. The three prisoners were held in high esteem by the ministers and Sharp was expected to co-operate with them in all matters relating to Scotland and to religion. He seems in fact to have worked with Lauderdale throughout his stay in London, but Lauderdale's devotion to the Covenant proved to be of the same character as that of Monck, that of a politician and a courtier, and Sharp himself was before all things a politician.

When Sharp arrived in London on February 13th, he found the City seething with excitement over the question of the secluded members. These were the men who had been excluded from the House of Commons by Pride's Purge in 1648. They were presbyterians and royalists and their re-admission to parliament was desired by all who hoped for the restoration of the king. The Rump was but a remnant of the Long Parliament and many constitutencies were

8. Wodrow, Hist., i.5n,6.

9. Cf. Reg. Consult., ii.211.

unrepresented. Monck had attempted to remedy this by securing from the Rump a promise to take measures to fill the vacant seats with a view to bring about a legal dissolution and make arrangements for future elections, but the members were in no hurry to carry out their promise. During the period of Monck's march on London and since, many addresses had been made to him and to the Speaker in favour of a free parliament and the admission of the secluded members. While he was at Leicester on January 21st Monck replied to the address of the gentlemen of Devonshire giving his reasons for being unwilling to grant this request. Many of the secluded members were royalist and wished to restore the king and annul all the laws made since their seclusion. This would mean the abolition of religious liberty and the abrogation of the grants of land made from royal, ecclesiastical and forfeited estates, much of which had been the subject of sales and marriage settlements, thus creating vested interests which could only be interfered with at the risk of bloodshed in all the three nations.¹⁰

By the time Monck reached London the vacant seats had not been filled. The City, where presbyterianism was strong, had no members in the House, and, on the ground that the House was not representative, the Common Council refused to pay taxes until the secluded members were re-admitted. The Rump dissolved the City Council and ordered Monck to remove the gates of the City and

10. Clarke Papers, iv. 258n; Parl. Hist., xxii. 68-70; C.S.P.D., 1659-60, p. 332.

arrest eleven citizens. Monck carried out this order in accordance with his principle of obedience to the civil power. He did so unwillingly, realising that the order had been given with the object of discrediting him and making him unpopular. The City was very much disturbed and depressed, but Monck took steps to undo the harm that had been done. On Saturday, February 11th, when the members of the House had taken their seats and begun business, a letter was delivered, signed by Monck and fourteen of his officers. It accused them of factious behaviour and demanded that they should immediately define the qualifications of members and issue writs for election to the vacant seats by the Friday following. When the places had been filled they were to sit only until May 6th, and thereafter a new parliament was to be elected.¹¹ The reply to this letter did not satisfy Monck. He immediately asked the Mayor to summon the City Council to the Guildhall, where he informed them of his dislike for Parliament's orders and of the letter he had sent to the House, and his popularity was at once restored. Sharp's first letter to Edinburgh after his arrival referred to the delight of the City on hearing of Monck's letter to Parliament. Meanwhile Monck had stationed all his forces in the City and taken up his quarters at Drapers' Hall. The Rump made every effort to induce him to return ~~return~~ to his lodgings at Whitehall, and Sharp is reported to have

11. Clarke Papers, iv. 262n; Parl. Hist., xxi., 98-102; Ludlow, Memoirs, ii. 231.

been largely instrumental in preventing such a false step.¹² The republican members of the House were determined to perpetuate their power, and the best way to frustrate them seemed to be to restore the secluded members. Those in favour of this step did their utmost to bring about an understanding between Monck, the secluded members and the more moderate of the sitting members. Conferences were held between representatives of both sides, and Sharp performed his share in the proceedings by acting as an intermediary between Monck and "some of the most eminent secluded members." The Rump as a whole remained obdurate, but Monck was satisfied, and on February 21st he secured the admission of the secluded members to Parliament.¹³

Before they took their seats on the morning of their admission they were addressed by Monck and informed of the conditions he expected them to observe. He still professed to be against monarchy for the reason that, if the king were restored, the liberty of the people's representatives in Parliament would be lost and prelacy would be brought in. He expressed the opinion that "moderate, not rigid, Presbyterian Government, with a sufficient liberty for consciences truly tender" appeared to be the most

12. Wodrow, Hist., i.6; Gumble, Life of Monk, 246, 259; C.S.P.D., 1659-60, pp. 358, 360, 370; Ludlow, Memoirs, 220n; Baillie, L. & J., iii.441 -- "In the meantyme, Hasilrig, Scot and others did send many messages to him, and near had gained him to come out of the Citie and lye at Whitehall: but Mr. Sharp's night labours here were happy."

13. Clarke Papers, iv.264; Gumble, Life of Monk, 260-1; Wodrow, Hist., i.6-7.

acceptable way for the settlement of the church in the state of affairs then existing. The work of parliament was to be to arrange for the maintenance of the armies in the three nations, to appoint a Council of State to carry on the government till a new parliament should be elected to prepare the issuing of writs for summoning a parliament for the 20th of April, with such qualifications as would secure the public cause. The parliament elected on these qualifications was to meet to establish the commonwealth without a king, single person or house of lords, and was to be legally dissolved to make way for a succession of parliaments.¹⁴

Sharp wrote an account of the proceedings to Douglas, remarking that he knew that some of the expressions in Monck's speech would not please him, but considering the situation some men "put a fair construction upon them." This was doubtless his own attitude, but Douglas was much perturbed. He wrote to both Sharp and Monck protesting against the application of the term "rigid" to presbytery. Monck's reply, written a fortnight later, showed some misunderstanding of Douglas's position. Monck referred to conversations he had had with Douglas in Scotland and implied that the Scots were indifferent to the form of civil government provided they kept the presbyterian form of church government. He deprecated the shedding of blood for any particular form of civil government and stated that he considered presbytery "the best expedient to

¹⁴. Parl. Hist. xxii. 140-143.

heal the divisions of these poor nations, soe it be moderate and tender." He was glad, he added, that Douglas agreed with him in this, for he had acted in order to secure protection from tyranny and anarchy and the just liberty of the churches of Jesus Christ, and he hoped that good men would not quarrel with him if he did not proceed in every particular according to their judgement. He asked Douglas to use his interest for the preservation of the peace and the quieting of men's spirits. This reply did not satisfy Douglas, who wrote of his doubts to Sharp expressing the fear that the course Monck was following to avoid bloodshed might result in heavier judgements upon the country. 15

The part Sharp had played in the events described above was considered by himself and his friends as a substantial contribution to the success of the presbyterian cause, but nothing could be done for the present regarding his instructions from Scotland, since parliament was limited to making preparations for the calling of a new parliament and might sit for only a few days. He, therefore, suggested that he might be recalled, and Douglas was willing that he should return if Monck advised him to do so. The House, however, was in no hurry to rise. Sharp soon found that there was plenty of work for him to do. Monck needed his services and showed so much confidence in him that he was constantly sought out by those who had any representations to make to the General. Moreover the matter of the Solemn League and Covenant soon came

to the fore, for the presbyterian majority in parliament were resolved to make sure of a settlement favourable to themselves before they made way for their successors.

To begin with everything seemed to go well for the presbyterian cause. A day of thanksgiving was appointed to be observed on Tuesday, February 28th, when the presbyterians, Calamy and Manton, preached to parliament at St. Margaret's, Westminster. Monck gave every encouragement to the presbyterian ministers and frequently received them at St. James's. On Sunday, February 26th, he and his wife communicated at Calamy's church and he afterwards promised that he would allow none to preach before him but those who were recommended by Calamy. Sharp reported on March 4th that parliament had declared the Confession of the Westminster Assembly to be the doctrine of the Church of England, except the two chapters on church discipline and censures, which were remitted to a committee, where they were expected to remain till the next parliament sat. On the following day the act was passed through all its stages, and it was ordered that the Solemn League and Covenant should be printed and set up in all churches in England and Wales and on the door of Parliament House.¹⁶

This news was welcome to Sharp's colleagues in Scotland, but he was already warning them that the cavalier party was growing in strength and popularity, that there was considerable opposition

¹⁶. Wodrow, Hist., 6-9; Kennet, Register, 66, 68, 77, 78.



to presbyterian government and the phrase "no bishop, no king" was being heard. He wrote on one occasion that even the friends of the Covenant in parliament were afraid to urge voting for presbyterian government for fear they might not be elected to the next parliament -- "Such an aversation there is in the body of the nation to it." He found the City ministers difficult to move and five of them to be "warping brethren and no friends to the Covenant interest." He must have realised very quickly the state of feeling in England and the necessity of compromise among the different interests which were in favour of the King's restoration, and he must have felt that it was going to be extremely difficult to reconcile his duty as emissary of the Edinburgh ministers with his part as trusted agent of General Monck. As early as March 1st he wrote to Douglas, "I have cause to wish I were taken off this employment, for I see matters involved into labyrinths from which the Only Wise can extricate."¹⁷

Monck, however, continued to show favour to the presbyterian ministers, and, according to Sharp's letter of March 10th, a mutual confidence existed between him and the leading men in the House, who were presbyterians. At the same time he still expressed himself in favour of a commonwealth, and rumours were spread abroad that the Scottish ministers were supporting such a settlement and were opposed to the restoration of the King on any terms. Sharp

17. Wodrow, Hist., i.9; Reg. Consult., ii.194.

immediately went to the leading presbyterians, the Earl of Manchester and Lord Wharton and several members of parliament and asserted that the Scots were in favour of the restoration of the King on Covenant terms and no other. He blamed Colonel Wetham and Dr. Gumble, Monck's chaplain and agent in dealing with the republicans, for spreading these reports.

The presbyterians were convinced that their interests would be safeguarded only if the present parliament could sit long enough to make terms with the King, but parliament had promised Monck to dissolve not later than March 16th. Great efforts were made by the ministers to persuade him to permit a longer session. On Sunday, March 11th, he sent his coach for Calamy, Ash and Sharp and held a long conversation with them in private. They convinced him that a commonwealth was impracticable and "beat him off that sconce he hath hitherto maintained", according to Sharp's report. They then urged upon him the necessity that parliament should sit long enough to arrange for the bringing in of the King on Covenant terms, but he pointed out that, in view of his past declarations, to permit this would not be consistent with his honour, and he argued that, although the secluded members could now outvote the rumpers, the members of the new parliament would act with greater authority. The three ministers left Monck professing to be convinced, but Sharp was sure that the sitting parliament would take measures to prepare the way for the King's restoration.¹⁸

18. Wodrow, Hist., i.10,11; Reg.Consult., ii.194,196.

On March 16th parliament passed an act dissolving itself, providing for the issue of writs for summoning a new parliament to meet on April 26th, and ordaining that no one should be capable of being elected who was of the popish religion, or had aided the rebellion in Ireland, or since 1642 had been in arms against parliament. The sons of such men were also to be disqualified unless they had clearly shown their good will towards the parliament.¹⁹ They had done all that was possible to secure that the new parliament would carry on their work. Nevertheless they were uneasy. On the previous day Sharp had written to Douglas a letter which well expressed their doubts. The commonwealth party were ready to do anything to keep out the King, to make Monck Protector, if he would agree, and even to join with the papists, who were very busy. The spirit of the cavaliers was very high and might upset everything. There was danger that war would break out in the clash of interests. He added, however, that Monck was full of confidence in his own power to keep the peace and carry through his project successfully.²⁰ Monck was, indeed, taking strong measures to prevent trouble in the army, but, although he still represented himself to be in favour of a commonwealth, he had come to the conclusion that in order to avoid bloodshed it was necessary that he should himself enter into negotiations with the King and secure his restoration with the safeguards he considered necessary.

¹⁹. Kennet, Register, 85; C.S.P.D., 1659-60, p.395.

²⁰. Wodrow, Hist., i.11.

A few days after the dissolution he got into touch with Sir John Grenville, the King's emissary, and the negotiations were carried on which resulted in the Declaration of Breda of April 4th. Complete secrecy was preserved until the new parliament met, and Monck so arranged it that the invitation to the King should come from that parliament. Meanwhile the presbyterian Council of State was endeavouring to bring about the King's return on the terms of the Isle of Wight Treaty entered into with Charles I at Carisbrooke in 1648.²¹

It is probable that Sharp thoroughly realised by the date of the dissolution that a restoration on Covenant terms was impossible. On March 17th he wrote to Edinburgh expressing the desire to return to his charge. He had contributed to the re-admission of the secluded members and supported their cause. They had done their work "to the satisfaction of the honest party of this nation", and he could be of no more use till the new parliament sat. Douglas, however, asked him to remain as long as he could be of any service to Monck or the Scottish nobles lately set at liberty.²²

With these nobles Sharp had been in touch since his arrival in London. From the time of the admission of the secluded members he had bestirred himself to hasten their release from imprisonment, which had taken place on March 4th on condition that they should

21. Kennet, Register, 86-8, 90, 96, 104-110, 114, 123.

22. Wodrow, Hist., i. 12.

give security not to disturb the public peace or go to Scotland without permission of the Council or parliament. Scotland had not been represented in the dissolved parliament and was not to be represented in the new parliament, and Sharp had suggested on March 10th that an authorisation should be sent from Scotland to Lauderdale and Crawford Lindsay to act as commissioners. Douglas, who apparently desired a more representative commission, replied that he had thought of such a step, but it would be necessary to obtain a warrant for a meeting to appoint a commission, of which Crawford and Lauderdale might be members. Such a warrant could only be given by General Monck, and he proved unwilling to give it. The matter was complicated by the fact that there were two other parties in Scotland who wished to secure the election of commissioners favourable to their aims. The Protesters were anxious to have meetings for the purpose in the western shires. They were willing to appoint Lauderdale and Crawford Lindsay to allay suspicion, but their real aim was to obtain the appointment of some of their own friends. They were said to be backed by the Earls of Lothian and Loudoun and secretly by Argyll, and to be endeavouring to win the support of the Earl of Selkirk (later Duke of Hamilton) and the Earl of Cassillis. Monck was reported to have been informed that their inclinations were towards Lambert, and this may have contributed to his decision to refuse the request of Douglas.

Douglas was perhaps not aware of this movement at the time. At all events he seems to have been more seriously

concerned about the proceedings of the royalist party. He heard that they intended to meet without permission on April 5th to elect commissioners to proceed from Scotland to London, and he feared they might choose men who would be "dissatisfying to the sober and well-affected of the nation", particularly as he was informed that they objected to Crawford Lindsay and Lauderdale being included among them. He, therefore, wrote to Sharp on March 31st urging that a warrant should be sent for a meeting in Scotland of shires and burghs, or of a select committee (of which he enclosed a list), at Edinburgh to choose commissioners to look after the interests of Scotland. He repeated this request on April 3rd, saying that the Earl of Glencairn was in favour of the committee he had suggested, and expressing his surprise that Monck should have forgotten Scotland's offers of service at the beginning of his undertaking, which he had often previously acknowledged. Sharp wrote on April 5th that a warrant could not be obtained for reasons which would be explained to Douglas at Edinburgh. Monck had informed him that the sending of commissioners to parliament would be of no advantage to Scotland, and on the 13th he wrote that he had received letters from Mr. Bruce²² at the Hague which showed that it was the king's desire that Scotland should make no applications until he had been restored.²³

22. Alexander Bruce, afterwards Earl of Kincardine, who carried letters between the king and the Scottish nobles. Cal.Cl.S.P. iv.619.

23. Reg.Consult. ii.p.xxxiv; L.P. i.14; Baillie, L.&J., iii.446; Wodrow, Hist., i.14 - 19.

The Scottish nobility had also moved in the matter. They had sent one of their number to London with instructions to urge Monck to allow them to meet to choose commissioners. Lauderdale, Crawford Lindsay and Sinclair endeavoured to support him by speaking to members of the Council. They were not successful, but they found out what Monck's objection was. They strongly advised the Scots to do nothing without Monck's permission, pointing out that the appearance of Scots in London with power to represent their nation would be likely to cause suspicion. Nevertheless, the Scottish royalists met on April 6th. It appears that they did so in virtue of a warrant received from Monck the previous January for a meeting of commissioners from the shires and burghs to choose representatives to go to London to present to parliament a petition relating to their grievances. At the meeting, which took place on February 2nd, five commissioners were chosen who arrived in London before February 15th. They were the Earls of Glencairn and Home, Mungo Murray, brother of the Earl of Atholl, Sir Alexander Gibson of Durie and Sir Archibald Stirling of Carden. Another session was the meeting held on April 6th, at which the commission to these five seems to have been continued.²⁴ It is presumably of them that Douglas wrote on April 21st that commissioners were coming up against

24. Cal.Cl.S.P.iv.562; L.P.,i.8,15,15n. Cf. Nicoll's Diary,272,279.

May 1st Sharp wrote concerning them to Douglas, "I think their

his will and that of all soberminded people. His opinion was that those who supported them were enemies of the Solemn League and Covenant. Yet he hoped that Monck would treat them with consideration. Glencairn appears to have made the journey later than the other commissioners, for Douglas wrote that he was following them, adding that he had given assurances that he would act in the interests of the liberty of the nation and of the Covenant, and expressing the hope that Lauderdale, Crawford Lindsay and Sinclair would co-operate with him.

Two days earlier Douglas had sent Sharp a very vigorous criticism of the authority of this commission to speak for the Scottish nation and had declared himself to be of Sharp's opinion that the Scots should not seek to have a share in the treaty with the King, a view which he justified on the ground that Charles had already been crowned King of Scotland and at his coronation had confirmed all the liberties of the kirk and state; these liberties and his royal authority were still in force, although they had been interrupted by the unjust violence of a usurper; Scotland, therefore, had nothing to seek, and they would wait quietly for the sitting of the parliament, which would, in accordance with the Solemn League and Covenant, on grounds of conscience, remove all force from Scotland and declare her to be a free nation. The King, however, seems to have welcomed the coming of the commissioners, and on May 1st Sharp wrote concerning them to Douglas, "I think their

coming here at this time hath been ordered for good." ²⁵ Monck probably had no objection to their arrival, as they obviously did not come as representatives of the Scottish kirk and state, and it was not unwelcome to the King, as he had been getting into touch with the Scottish nobility.

Douglas was in the main right about the attitude of the Commissioners to the Solemn League and Covenant, but he was wrong in believing Glencairn's assurances. He was wrong also in trusting to Lauderdale's loyalty to the Covenant, and even Crawford Lindsay, though he was a loyal presbyterian, proved capable of abandoning it at the King's desire. Sharp had been bidden to co-operate with Lauderdale and he followed his instructions. He undoubtedly knew much of what was going on behind the scenes, but he could not have warned Douglas without embarrassing Monck, and he was now convinced of the truth of Sir Harry Vane's jibe that the Covenant was an "almanac out of date".

60. Wodrow, Hist., i.19; Reg. Consult., ii.pp.xxxv, 203, 205, 206; Cal.Cl.S.P., iv.645.

Already in March the King was beginning to consider means for bringing about a religious settlement in England. He was willing to grant the liberty for tender consciences which Housack desired, and the religious settlement which he himself preferred was the establishment of episcopacy with toleration for all nonconformists including catholics. As far as England was concerned no other establishment than episcopacy was possible for him. From his youth up he had been surrounded by loyal and devoted episcopallians who had given up everything for the Stuart cause. His father had died because he refused to be disloyal to episcopacy.

IV

The English Presbyterians and the Solemn League and Covenant -- in keeping with the royal prerogative and the majority of the English people obviously preferred it. He owed his escape from Worcester and probably his life to the loyalty of catholics. He was to owe his restoration to the help of the presbyterians, and he had no desire to persecute the sectaries. To presbyterians toleration to catholics and sectaries was entirely inadmissible, and the Solemn League and Covenant forbade toleration to episcopallians.

Sharp's Mission to the King.

The leading English presbyterians, however, realised that it was impossible to impose presbytery on England, and rather than agree to toleration for the sects the majority of them were willing to consider the idea of comprehension in a Church of England organized under bishops with limited powers, provided there was some revision of the prayer book. The king was ready to accept such a compromise, hoping that he would be able to grant toleration nevertheless. Hyde also was prepared to support it, believing that if the Church of England were

Already in March the King was beginning to consider means for bringing about a religious settlement in England. He was willing to grant the liberty for tender consciences which Monck desired, and the religious settlement which he himself preferred was the establishment of episcopacy with toleration for all nonconformists including catholics. As far as England was concerned no other establishment than episcopacy was possible for him. From his youth up he had been surrounded by loyal and devoted episcopalians who had given up everything for the Stuart cause. His father had died because he refused to be disloyal to episcopacy. He himself preferred episcopal government as most in keeping with the royal prerogative and the majority of the English people obviously preferred it. He owed his escape from Worcester and probably his life to the loyalty of catholics, he was to owe his restoration to the help of the presbyterians, and he had no desire to persecute the sectaries. To presbyterians toleration to catholics and sectaries was entirely inadmissible, and the Solemn League and Covenant forbade toleration to episcopalians. The leading English presbyterians, however, realised that it was impossible to impose presbytery on England, and rather than agree to toleration for the sects ~~the~~ majority of them were willing to consider the idea of comprehension in a Church of England organized under bishops with limited powers, provided there was some revision of the prayer book. The king was ready to accept such a compromise, hoping that he would be able to grant toleration nevertheless. Hyde also was prepared to support it, believing that if the Church of England were

preserved it would gradually regain all its former powers. The chief obstacles were the indiscreet utterances of some episcopalian divines, who showed their desire to persecute the presbyterians, and the presbyterians' distrust of Hyde.¹

Before the end of March one of the king's chaplains, the calvinist Dr. Morley, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, was sent to London to vindicate the protestantism of the king, which had been questioned by those who were opposed to his restoration, and to conciliate the presbyterians. Dr. John Barwick, who had performed devoted services to both Charles I and Charles II and suffered on that account strict imprisonment in the Tower, was in London working in the interests of the Church of England. Several laymen also were using their interest with the presbyterians. From about the middle of March meetings between divines of both parties were being mooted, and Sharp wrote to Douglas on March 27th that he had been several times asked to meet some episcopalians, but he had refused. Douglas saw no objection to a meeting provided the London presbyterian ministers were agreeable. He thought Sharp might have urged them to co-operate in settling the civil government, leaving church government to the parliament, who, he hoped, being men of conscience would feel bound to decide in favour of the Covenant.²

1. Cl.S.P.,iii.732; Cal.Cl.S.P.,iv.664.

2. Ibid.iv.550,578,581,599,604,629-30,634; Cl.S.P.,iii.716; Wodrow, Hist.,i.17.

on April 11th Lauderdale had been concerned with Sharp in the discussions with the London ministers, and on April 5th Sharp reported that they had met with ten trustworthy presbyterian ministers "to concert measures against sectaries and cavaliers." It had been agreed that they must endeavour to bring in the king upon Covenant terms and remove the prejudice created against the presbyterians by the fact that a few of their ministers had opposed the restoration of the king. Lauderdale and he had also got the ministers to undertake to agree among themselves about terms before they met episcopalian representatives to discuss an accommodation. He warned Douglas, however, that he saw no reason to hope for a settlement on Covenant terms, and he repeated the warning on April 7th, although he reported at the same time that the presbyterians were resolved to stick to their principles.³

Dr. Morley appeared before the presbyterians and gave his testimony to the king's protestantism and it was decided to publish letters from French protestant ministers to the same effect.⁴ On April 12th it was resolved that the presbyterian ministers might individually speak with members of the episcopal party, and Sharp agreed to meet Morley.⁵ Morley reported to Hyde

3. Ibid. 18-19; Reg. Consult., ii. p. xxxii.

4. The Countess of Balcarres, Sir Robert Moray and Richard Baxter were the chief agents in this matter. Lauderdale, Douglas and Sharp had also given their testimony to Charles's good conduct and orthodoxy during his stay in Scotland. Rel. Baxt. 215; Wodrow, Hist., i. 10-11; Cal. Cl. S. P., iv. 603.

5. Wodrow, Hist., i. 19; Reg. Consult., ii. 202.

on April 13th the result of his conversations with the leading English presbyterian ministers. He found that they were willing to accept bishops provided they should not have the power of acting without the consent of the clergy. The episcopalians thought it essential that the bishops should have this power in the last resort, although they must always consult their clergy and ask their advice. Morley explained that the bishops were bound in their actions by canons and ecclesiastical laws, and if a bishop transgressed any of these he was answerable to a free synod. Therefore, he contended, episcopal rule could not be tyrannical. Dr. Reynolds was satisfied with this argument, but Calamy and others were not. Morley hoped, however, that they might be convinced later. He was not in favour of a conference between episcopalians and presbyterians, as he thought it would have no result, and he advocated the discussion of all differences in a national synod and a free parliament. He reported also that he had talked with the Earl of Manchester and found he was willing to use his influence to induce the ministers to agree to episcopacy as Morley had explained it to them.⁶

Meanwhile efforts were being made to induce leading Scottish presbyterian noblemen to exert influence over the English presbyterian ministers. Dr. Barwick had met Crawford Lindsay and Lauderdale in the Tower when they were emprisoned there after the

6. Cl.S.P.,iii.727-8.

battle of Worcester, and, therefore, found it easy to approach them. He informed Hyde on April 6th that Lauderdale had denied vehemently that he belonged to any faction and protested that he was willing to obey the King's commands in anything. Crawford Lindsay was more difficult, but after a second interview Barwick was able to write to the King on April 10th that Crawford Lindsay had authorised him to say that, though he professed himself to be a presbyterian, he would "endeavour to bring the presbyterian party in England to such moderation as not to disturb the settlement of the church business". Writing to Hyde on the same date, Barwick remarked that he had expected an encounter with James Sharp who, he was informed by Lauderdale, was moderate. Thus it seems evident that, although Lauderdale and Sharp may have been acting straightforwardly in their earlier meetings with the London ministers, their later efforts on behalf of a Covenant settlement cannot have been wholehearted.⁷

A suggestion that a synod from all reformed churches should be called to settle the Church of England was reported by Sharp to Douglas on April 13th. Douglas strongly disapproved of calling in foreign divines. The Westminster Assembly and parliament had, he wrote on April 24th, already agreed with reference to religion, and it would be strange if the parliament should question the king's willingness to ratify that agreement. With

7. Cl.S.P.iii.723; Cal.Cl.S.P.iv.647.

regard to doctrine he argued that there were no differences to be decided, and as to church government he pointed out that in the time of James VI the writings of foreign divines had helped the introduction of episcopacy.

On the 19th Sharp wrote that the parliament would bring in the King on terms honourable to himself and safe to the nations, but the question of religion would be omitted from the treaty and left to be settled by a synod. Later, in a letter without date, he wrote that he feared the Solemn League and Covenant would be neglected and the fairest accommodation which moderate men who wished well to religion expected was moderate episcopacy. Sharp was expressing the views of his present associates, the London ministers and the presbyterian noblemen, both English and Scottish. Douglas held a very different view. The Scots had learned from experience that moderate episcopacy led to the highest prelacy. A settlement on the basis of the Solemn League and Covenant would afford the greatest security for the King and the nations. He was convinced that the opportunity was favourable, for it was not probable that the King would refuse to accept it. Therefore, the responsibility would lie upon the English presbyterians if they rejected God's ordinance and would have "a plant of their own settling which God never planted." He feared too that Scotland would be influenced by the English church settlement, "for the generality of this new upstart generation have no love to presbyterial government, but are wearied of that yoke,

feeding themselves with the fancy of episcopacy, or moderate episcopacy." ⁸

Douglas feared that Alexander Bruce, who was still acting as intermediary between the King and the Scots, was not representing fairly the position of the Resolutioners in Scotland or the services they had done for the King. He suggested that Monck should permit Sharp to go over to the King that he might show him who were his real friends. Before he had received the letter containing this suggestion Sharp wrote to Douglas that Monck had asked him to go over to Breda to inform the King of passages in his undertaking known to Douglas and himself, to tell him of matters in Scotland and to persuade him to write a letter to Calamy stating that he intended to "own the godly sober party and stand for the protestant religion." Sharp felt he could not refuse and expressed his regret that he could not wait to receive Douglas's permission.⁸ Parliament had met on April 25th. On May 1st, the date on which Sharp wrote, the King's letters to parliament and to Monck and the Declaration of Breda were read, and Lords and Commons voted the king's return on the terms proposed in the Declaration, by which the settlement of religious difficulties was to be made by a future parliament and indulgence was promised to tender consciences.

8. Wodrow, Hist., i.19-21; Reg.Consult. ii.205-6.

Sharp left for Breda on May 4th. On that morning he wrote to Douglas that a deputation of ministers from the City, Oxford and Cambridge was to follow him the following week to congratulate the King and he was to arrange for their reception. He suggested to Douglas that the Scottish ministers should send their congratulations to the King by letter. From Gravesend on his way to the Downs, where he hoped to find a frigate which would leave that night for Holland, he wrote of his mission to his friend James Wood at St. Andrews. He arrived ^{at the Downs} that afternoon and went on board the Naseby, where he had some conversation with Samuel Pepys, to whom he gave the news that commissioners had been chosen by the Lords and Commons to go to the King, and that Dr. Clarges, Monck's brother-in-law, was to go from the army and would reach the Downs on the following day. Sharp arrived at Breda on the evening of May 8th on the same day as Clarges, with whom he presumably travelled in the frigate, Advice, which left the Downs on Sunday, May 6th.⁹

He was at once taken to court by Alexander Bruce and presented by the Marquis of Ormonde to the King, to whom he delivered his letters of commendation. The following morning he had a private audience of an hour and a half with the King in his bedchamber, and he gave an account of Monck's proceedings and showed how the Scots had used the opportunity for the royal

9. Wodrow, Hist., 21-2; L.P., 24-5; Pepys, Diary, May 4th, 1660. Kennet, Register, 136.

service. In the evening of the same day the King called him to walk with him in the garden, and, although there were nearly two hundred gentlemen in attendance, talked with him for almost two hours. He had three further interviews with the King at Breda, and found he had a surprisingly good memory of Scotland and Scottish affairs. He enquired particularly about the ministers who had been in the Tower, and remembered also George Hutheson, James Wood and Robert Baillie. Owing to the King's desire to discuss Monck's affairs and his extreme business, since crowds had come to court from England, Sharp was not able to say quite all he had intended about church matters, and at the last interview, after bidding him wait upon him at the Hague on the 15th to receive his despatch to England, the King had said that he would reserve communing about Scotland until his coming to England. Sharp, however, assured Douglas that the King was resolved to restore Scotland to her former liberties and to preserve the settled government of the church.

Before going to the Hague Sharp had time to visit Dort, Amsterdam, Haarlem and Leyden, "to take a transient view of these goodly towns." He arrived at the Hague the day after the King and watched his reception of the commissioners from the two Houses of Parliament and the City of London. The City ministers, Drs Reynolds and Spurstowe, and Messrs. Calamy, Manton, Hall and Case, had now arrived at the Hague. They were received in the king's bedchamber

and delivered a letter signed by over eighty ministers, who had met at Sion College. Three days later they had private audiences two by two and it was reported that they had received great satisfaction from the King. According to Hyde's relation, however, there was one point on which they were not satisfied. They had asked that the King would not use the prayerbook entirely and formally in his chapel at Whitehall for fear of offending the people who had long been unaccustomed to its use, and he had replied that while he gave them liberty he would not renounce his own, he had always used that form of service which he thought the best in the world, he would not enquire strictly about the form of prayer used in other churches, but he would have no other used in his own chapel. Sharp saw much of the ministers during the next few days. He had expected to receive his despatches for England from Lord Chancellor Hyde immediately on his arrival, but he was asked to stay until the City ministers were ready to return. They are said to have exchanged several visits with the King's chaplains in a very friendly spirit, and doubtless Sharp also took part in this intercourse. He remained at the Hague until the King's departure on May 23rd and crossed to Dover on one of the King's frigates along with the London ministers, arriving in London on the 26th, having witnessed all the rejoicings connected with the King's landing.¹⁰

10. Wodrow, Hist., i.28,29-30, 30n-32n; L.P., i.26-8; Kennet, Register, 139 (Public Intelligence, 4th No.21.), 152; Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, vi. (ed. Macray), 231-2, (xvi.242-4.).

Sharp took with him to Holland a letter from Sir John Grenville to Hyde, which contained Monck's reasons for recommending Sharp to the King. It asked that Hyde would give him credit because Monck looked upon him "as a very honest man, and one that may be very useful to his Majesty several ways, both here and in Scotland, especially in moderating the affairs of the kirk and our church, being a person very moderate in his opinion, and who hath a very good reputation with the ministers of both kingdoms." He had also a letter to the King from the Earl of Lauderdale, praising his activity and usefulness in the King's service and stating that he knew all that Lauderdale knew of the situation and would give full and clear information about it.¹¹ It seems evident from these letters and from Sharp's letters to Douglas that he was co-operating with Monck, Lauderdale and other presbyterian nobles to bring about in England a settlement of episcopacy which would include moderate presbyterians. His letters to Edinburgh were calculated to discourage the Scots from attempting to take concerted action with English ministers in favour of a Covenant settlement, and this may have been the chief service to the King required of him at this juncture. He was probably convinced that he was doing no disservice to the kirk in acting thus, for there can be little doubt that he was right when he wrote to Douglas on the eve of his departure for Holland, that to press for uniformity in church government

11. Cl.S.P.,iii.741; L.P.,i.23-4.

would create prejudice against the existing Scottish church settlement.¹²

In Holland for the first time Sharp came into contact with Hyde, who was reputed to be hostile both to the Scots and to presbytery. There also were General Middleton, Hyde's friend and a former acquaintance of Sharp in Scotland, Lord Newburgh and other Scottish episcopalians, among them some of the clergy who had gone into exile for refusing to take the Covenant, as well as the King's chaplains. It is most probable that, in accordance with his usual practice, he improved the occasion by making the acquaintance of as many of them as possible in order to find out their opinions and their tendencies. Later the charge was brought against him that at Breda he had formed a plot with Hyde and Middleton to secure the introduction of episcopacy into Scotland,¹³ but it does not seem at all likely that so cautious a man as Sharp would have committed himself so far at this time.

Douglas appeared to have been almost convinced by Sharp of the uselessness of urging a Covenant settlement. "If they will not press it themselves, we are free," he wrote on May 8th. Nevertheless, in their letter of congratulation to the King of the same date, the Edinburgh ministers showed that this was the settlement for which they hoped. They told him that the principles of the Church of

12. Wodrow, Hist., i.22; Reg. Consult., ii.206.

13. Wodrow, Hist., 28, 61; Baillie, L. & J., iii.484.

Scotland were so consistent with the preservation of lawful authority that he need never repent that he had entered into a covenant for maintaining them, and that they were confident both that he would protect that church in her established privileges and that he would settle the house of God, according to his word, in all his dominions. The King probably knew that they meant according to the Covenant, although he himself would have interpreted their words differently. They held that it was their duty to put forward the arguments in favour of the Covenant so long as the religious settlement was being discussed, and they seem not yet to have given up the hope that their arguments might prevail. Thus in the instructions they sent to Sharp with these letters they asked him to inform the King of the number of presbyterians in England who could not acknowledge episcopacy to be of God's institution, and they suggested various arguments he might use to prove to the King that it was unlawful. On May 12th they wrote directly to the London ministers, Calamy, Ash and Manton, expressing their fear of the consequences of setting up episcopacy and of the use^{of} the liturgy again, hoping that they would endeavour to prevent these evils and pointing out that they had to deal with a moderate prince ready to listen to sound and wholesome counsel.¹⁴ The London ministers, it would seem, did their best concerning the prayerbook, but they were convinced of the

14. Wodrow, Hist., i. 22n-23n, 26n-27n.

necessity of accepting moderate episcopacy.

The Edinburgh ministers were also seriously concerned about the King's promise of toleration to dissenters. In his letter of May 8th to Sharp Douglas had urged that the King need not declare any liberty to tender consciences in Scotland, "because the generality of the people and the whole ministry have embraced the established religion by law, with his Majesty's consent." When informed that the Earl of Rothes was leaving for Holland on May 10th Douglas and Hutcheson wrote to him asking him to do his utmost for the good of the church and to inform the King of the constant loyalty of the ministers and that there was no pretext for an indulgence to nonconformists in Scotland. On the same date they wrote again to Sharp reminding him to tell the King that there was no need of toleration in Scotland, and asking him to use every endeavour that the King should not use the service book on his return to England.

The ministers were aware that the Book of Common Prayer was in use at the King's court abroad, and to this they took no exception, but its use had been unlawful in England for some years, and they hoped that it would not be re-introduced until a religious settlement had been made, for they feared that, if the King made use of it in his chapel, his example would be generally followed and the future settlement of religion prejudged. Since the episcopal divines in England had not used the prayer book for

some years past, they thought the King might well follow the presbyterian observances, as he had done while in Scotland, until a settlement which should give more general satisfaction should be made. It would be a hardship also, they considered, to the Scots who thought it their duty to attend upon the King to be compelled to worship in a way of which they disapproved. They wrote to Crawford Lindsay and Lauderdale in London putting forward these views and earnestly begging them to speak with the King himself, when he reached London, with influential members of both Houses and with trustworthy ministers to secure that suitable chaplains should be appointed to attend him and perform family worship in accordance with presbyterian practices until a settlement should be made. It did not occur to them that it was a very great hardship to many sincerely devout members of the Church of England that they had been so long deprived of services which were dear to them. Indeed it could not occur to them since they considered the use of the service book to be sinful.¹⁵

Sharp did not receive the letters written to him from Scotland after his departure to Breda until he returned to London on May 26th. The King's entry into Whitehall took place on the 29th and Sharp's first opportunity of presenting the ministers' address was on Thursday, the 31st. He wrote on June 2nd that the King had expressed great pleasure on receiving it and had promised

15. Wodrow, Hist., ii. 24-6.

to consider it at his leisure. Their letter to the King sent to the Hague with Rothes, Sharp informed Douglas, had not yet been delivered. Sharp was later accused of having persuaded Rothes not to deliver this letter.¹⁶

Sharp's visit to Holland and his observation of the trend of events after his return to England confirmed his views on English church affairs. In all his succeeding letters to Scotland he emphasised the uselessness of urging the King to impose presbytery on England, since the majority of the nation and both Houses of Parliament were against^{it} and the most influential presbyterians were working for a settlement on Bishop Usher's model with permission not to use the surplice, the cross in baptism and kneeling at communion. (This was the plan of Richard Baxter, the old acquaintance and correspondent of Lauderdale and Sharp in Commonwealth times, who had come to London on April 13th.¹⁷) Sharp warned Douglas again and again that making further representations on the subject would merely bring upon the Scots the charge of interfering with English affairs and might endanger the existing Scottish settlement. He referred to rumours, raised to discredit the presbyterians, that the Scottish ministers were lamenting that the King had been restored on any other than Covenant terms, and he

16. Wodrow, Hist., ii.28,32.

17. Ibid. 19, and see above p.29; Cf. Rel.Baxt., 230-2.

warned him also that the coming of Scottish and Irish ministers as commissioners, which had been rumoured, would not be welcome in England, though he thought it would do good if Douglas himself came up to speak with the King and keep the Scottish noblemen right, some of whom had been attending Common Prayer.

About ten days later Sharp had changed his mind and had become doubtful of the wisdom of Douglas's proposed visit, and Crawford Lindsay and Lauderdale shared his doubts. Sharp feared Douglas's motives would be suspected by the episcopal party and he would be able to do little at the time on behalf of the Church of Scotland. His visit would be more useful in two or three months time before the instructions to the King's commissioner to the Scottish parliament were drawn up. Probably Sharp was right. It would have been painful to Douglas to see the triumph of episcopacy in England, and if he had insisted on making representations concerning the Solemn League and Covenant he would have been accused of interfering in English affairs and might have found it difficult to obtain an audience of the King.

That he would have made such representations seems clear from letters written from Edinburgh to Sharp about this time (the early part of June). Sharp's recent letters had filled the Scots ministers with dismay and were the occasion of a letter from Douglas and Smith, undated, and two letters from the whole group of Edinburgh ministers, dated 7th and 9th June respectively. They did not wish, they pointed out, to meddle unduly in the affairs of others/

others , but they feared that, since he was known to be their representative, if he did not explain their point of view, when occasion arose, with fitting prudence and discretion, it might be thought that they approved of a settlement contrary to the Covenant. They asked that he should tell the London ministers how much all good men in Scotland hoped that God might lead them forth to a right improvement of the great opportunity offered them of obtaining the long desired settlement. To them it seemed a simple matter to explain their point of view frankly to the King, who was "so excellent and moderate a prince." They urged Sharp himself to make humble representations to him, and they enclosed a paper containing the points they wished him to raise. He was to beg the King to reflect on the proceedings at his coronation in Scotland and consider his present duty in relation to them, to point out what anxiety the fear of episcopacy and the service book was causing to many loyal subjects, and to suggest that the King and his parliament should take time to find out the feelings of his people before coming to a decision.

Sharp had several times written of his desire to return home since he could do no good in London "for the stemming of the current for prelacy." On June 14th the King sent for him and told him he wished him to go back to Edinburgh to give the ministers an account of affairs. Therefore, when he received their letters on June 16th, he was expecting to begin his journey almost immediately. He knew very well that the representations he was asked to make to the King would be very far from pleasing and that they could have no practical result. He replied that he would not have time before

his departure to put their case to the King in a suitable manner. He assured them that he had used every opportunity he had had since coming to England to act in the interests of Scotland and the Covenant, and that when he returned he would be able to show them that he had done everything that the condition of affairs would allow. He was convinced, he declared, that it was not his duty in the circumstances which then existed to remind the King again of his coronation oath in Scotland and the duty that imposed upon him of settling presbytery upon England, since he knew that England would not endure it. He repeated his warning that to do anything which might be interpreted as interference in the affairs of England would greatly prejudice the Scots both in relation to their civil liberty and the settlement of religion. He granted that the English settlement might have an influence on Scottish affairs, but, since they could not prevent the establishment of episcopacy in England, he argued that it would be foolish to exasperate those who were looking for a pretext to overturn what had already been established in Scotland. He expressed the opinion that the reasonable men among the English presbyterians would accept a liturgy and a moderate episcopacy, which they termed effectual presbytery, and that they considered that by doing so they were guarding against a breach of the Covenant. He promised that, if he found an opportunity before he left London, he would explain their views to the King so far as it was expedient to do so and also make ^{them} ~~it~~ known to such ministers as he met, and this would show that the Scottish ministers did not approve of anything that might be done

in prejudice of the Covenant.¹⁸

Sharp was not to leave London till the end of August, and during the time he remained, whenever he dealt in his letters with the affairs of the Church of England, he repeated and re-inforced his previous arguments and gave news of the further progress of episcopacy, of the King's attitude and that of the English presbyterians. Dr. Reynolds, and Messrs. Calamy, Manton and Baxter accepted positions as royal chaplains on condition that, when their turn came to officiate, they should not be compelled to use the liturgy but that service was to be performed by others and they were only to preach. A royal chaplain of a different stamp was Dr. Crofts, who in a sermon preached before the King said that for the guilt he had contracted in Scotland, and the injuries he was brought to do against the Church of England, God had defeated him at Worcester and pursued his controversy with a nine years exile; and yet he would further pursue him, if he closed with his enemies, meaning, according to Sharp, the presbyterian members of the Privy Council. The King, Sharp reported, had expressed his dislike of the sermon and called Crofts a passionate preacher.

The King held a conference with five leading presbyterian ministers, and he told Monck and Manchester that he would insist upon the episcopalians being reconciled with them. He had, however, postponed the calling of a synod and had asked both parties to put their concessions in writing. Calamy sent to inform Sharp of

18. Wodrow, Hist., i.30-43.

their proceedings, but Sharp told him he would have nothing to do with these matters, and that their proposed accommodation was destructive to the settlement in Scotland. The ministers thereafter had several meetings at Sion College, and the majority of them agreed to Bishop Usher's model, set forms and an amended liturgy.¹⁹ About this time (the end of June) Sharp reported that he had seen a letter from Paris which stated that some learned protestants of France and some of the professors at Leyden had written that episcopacy was lawful, and if the King would write to the Assembly at Charenton in July there was no doubt that they would approve of the establishment of episcopacy in England. This was the result of the efforts of the Countess of Balcarres and Sir Robert Moray. There seem to have been difficulties in the way of communication between the protestant church of France and foreign protestants, but four individual ministers wrote in favour of moderate episcopacy.²⁰

Sharp had an opportunity about the middle of July to explain the views of the Edinburgh brethren to the English ministers. They excused their decision on the ground of the difficult circumstances and the need to consider the peace of the church. They showed Sharp a copy of the paper/^{WHICH} they had given in to the king and which he had praised for its learning and moderation, and as likely to make a beginning for a good settlement. After Sharp had

19. Ibid. 43-46.

20. Ibid. 46; Robertson, A. Life of Sir Robert Moray, 106-8; Cf. L.P., I. 28-30.

read it, he asked them if they thought it consistent with their Covenant engagements, and they replied they judged it was, as they had only yielded to a constant precedency and a reformed liturgy. Sharp, however, foresaw that the high episcopalians would ultimately have their way and no concessions would be made to the presbyterians. In his next letter he reported a long and heated debate on the religious settlement in the House of Commons after which it was decided to adjourn the matter until October 23rd and to ask the King to take the advice of some divines about settling ecclesiastical differences. Thus everything was left in the King's hands. In his description of the debate Sharp mentioned two parties -- "the high episcopal^{men}", and "the presbyterians, i.e. for the most part moderate episcopal men."

When Sharp returned to Edinburgh he brought a letter from Messrs. Calamy, Ash and Manton in reply to that of the Edinburgh ministers of May 12th. They defended the course they had taken by the necessity of choosing the lesser of two evils. It was impossible, they said, that presbytery should be established while the tide ran so strongly in favour of episcopacy, and the settlement of episcopacy with a bare toleration for presbytery would produce serious mischiefs, since such toleration would be extended to both papists and sectaries. Thus the only course to secure religion was to make presbytery part of the public establishment.²¹

21. Wodrow, Hist.i.51,52,53,54n.

The Edinburgh ministers were now convinced that it was not only useless to intervene further but also that it would be harmful to their own church settlement. Nevertheless they could not approve of the policy of the English presbyterians. They held that episcopal government was unlawful. To Douglas it was "the device of men", while presbyterial government was a "divine ordinance", episcopacy was "a plant which God never planted", a "stinking weed", which "the Lord will root out in his own time, whatever pains men take to plant it and make it grow." Moderate episcopacy he described as "a playing with the oath of God since it is unlawful and a step to the highest of episcopacy." He declared himself to be against episcopacy root and branch. He had hoped that the King would not make himself responsible for introducing it, but would leave the matter to be decided by the parliament and a synod of divines. "If they will have that moderate episcopacy, let it be a deed of their own, without approbation by his majesty."²²

In spite of all Sharp's efforts the leading Resolutioners never seem to have been able to grasp the fact that it was impossible to impose presbytery on England. Writing as late as January 1661 Robert Baillie blamed Chancellor Hyde, but could not understand why he had been so easily successful, "while a few hours treaty, or but a petition from the Houses, Generall and Citie, sent with the Commissioners to Breda, might easily have freed us for the great good of the land, of all these vexations."²³

²². Wodrow, Hist., i.15, 21, 41.

²³. Baillie, L. & J., iii.445; Cf. ibid. 406.

V

The King's letter to the Presbytery of Edinburgh --

Scotland and the Restoration.

At the time of the King's restoration large numbers of the Scottish nobility and gentry repaired to London, and the questions of the government of Scotland and the settlement of the Scottish church were soon being discussed. Among these Scots were few genuine covenanters. The majority had supported the kirk and the Covenants because they feared the loss of their share of the church lands and because they disliked the power of the bishops. Now that fear no longer existed and the tyranny of the kirk had proved greater than that of the bishops. They were all impoverished by the civil wars, and those who had not committed themselves too far in opposition to the kirk were now looking to the king for their fortunes by "the Restoration". They may be divided into three groups -- the royalists who had supported Montrose, the bagagers, to which party the great majority belonged, and the anti-bagagers and those who had actively complied with the usurping government. The last group was small, and the Protestants looked to them for support.

With the King in exile there had been for long the royalists General Middleton and Lord Perth, episcopallians and friends of Hyde. Lauderdale, Crawford Lindsay and Sinclair had been at liberty in London since the beginning of March. Glencairn and the other commissioners who were sent from Scotland against Monk's advice arrived on the eve of the Restoration. Rothes left Scotland for Holland on May 10th. Before the end of May the Earl of Belvoir, Lord Lorne, the Earl of Cassillis, and James Dalrymple of Stair set out for London. The Earl of Fife was there before June 7th,

At the time of the King's restoration large numbers of the Scottish nobility and gentry repaired to London, and the questions of the government of Scotland and the settlement of the Scottish church were soon being discussed. Among these Scots were few genuine covenanters. The majority had supported the kirk and the Covenants because they feared the loss of their share of the church lands and because they disliked the power of the bishops. Now that fear no longer existed and the tyranny of the kirk had proved greater than that of the bishops. They were all impoverished by the civil wars, and those who had not committed themselves too far in opposition to the Stuarts hoped in some measure to redeem their fortunes by winning the favour of Charles II. They may be divided into three groups -- the royalists who had supported Montrose, the Engagers, to which party the great majority belonged, and the anti-Engagers and those who had actively complied with the usurping government. The last group was small, and the Protesters looked to them for support.

With the King in exile there had been for long the royalists, General Middleton and the Lord of Newburgh, episcopalians and friends of Hyde. Lauderdale, Crawford Lindsay and Sinclair had been at liberty in London since the beginning of March. Glencairn and the other commissioners who were sent from Scotland against Monck's advice arrived on the eve of the Restoration. Rothes left Scotland for Holland on May 10th. Before the end of May the Earl of Selkirk, Lord Lorne, the Earl of Cassillis, and James Dalrymple of Stair set out for London. The Earl of Tweeddale was there before June 9th,

and the Earls of Loudoun and Lothian had arrived before the end of the month. The Marquis of Argyll rashly appeared at the Court on July 8th, and was immediately committed to the Tower.¹

The Resolutioners looked upon all these/except Middleton and Newburgh/as supporters of the existing church settlement in Scotland. They urged the necessity of their being kept united and Sharp wrote frequently of his endeavours to this end. It was no easy matter owing to personal differences and conflicting interests. The Protesters looked for support to Cassillis, Lothian, Loudoun and Tweeddale and Dalrymple of Stair, but all of them were afraid of being compromised in the King's eyes, and Sharp wrote on June 9th that there was none in London who did not disclaim the Protesters. Cassillis, in Douglas's opinion, was "beyond all exception", and Sharp expressed his opinion of his loyalty. Later he remarked, "Cassillis is honest but not for this court", and he reported that the King had no regard for Loudoun and Lothian, but this did not surprise the Resolutioners.²

All were agreed on the necessity of withdrawing the English forces and garrisons from Scotland. This was opposed by both Monck and Hyde, and many representations were necessary. Eventually the King promised that the field forces should be withdrawn "presently", the garrison of Edinburgh as soon as a Scottish garrison could be

1. Wodrow, Hist., i. 25, 29, 32, 45, 50.

2. Ibid. 29, 32, 38, 44; Baillie, L. & J., iii. 443.

raised, and the other garrisons as soon as possible. They were not unanimous on the question of the government of Scotland. After heated debates it was decided to petition the King that the government should be carried on until parliament met by the Committee of Estates captured at Alyth in 1651. There had been some opposition to this on the part of Cassillis, Loudoun, Lothian and Lorne, who feared that the Committee might wish to take exception to the actions of the parliament of 1649. The King decided to grant the petition with the stipulation that the vacancies should be filled up from men who had taken no part in the Remonstrance or otherwise disclaimed the King's authority.³ Thus was secured an interim government which was royalist, and which had the support of the Resolutioners.

On the question of church government there was little unity, and even on the part of professed presbyterians there was some hesitation. Sharp wrote re-assuringly from time to time that the King would maintain the existing settlement of the Scottish church, but clearly he was not quite easy in his mind about this. There were many influences against it and he took care to point them out to Douglas. "Our noblemen and others here," he wrote, keep in a fair way of seeming accord, but I find a high loose spirit appearing in some of them, and I hear they talk of bringing in episcopacy to Scotland," and again, "I am not edified by the speeches and carriage

3. Wodrow, Hist., i. 44, 53, 57; Reg. Consult. ii. 208.

of divers of our countrymen in reference to the Covenant and ministry when they are come up here." On June 14th he wrote that the King had sent for him to speak on Scottish church matters, which were thoroughly understood by his Majesty who remembered well all about the public resolutions. He had expressed his resolution to preserve the discipline and government of the kirk, to call a General Assembly as soon as possible and to send for ministers from Scotland for consultation when affairs in England were settled. He desired Sharp to go to Edinburgh to explain the position and promised to give him a letter.⁴

Sharp was not to return for over two months. The King's letter could not be written till the Secretary for Scotland should be appointed, and there were matters upon which it was difficult to obtain agreement. It is evident that the question which chiefly exercised the minds of the King and the Scottish nobility was how to ensure that the church should be controlled by the state. On June 21st Sharp wrote, "I suspect the general bent of our countrymen carries them to Erastianism among us." A week later he reported that he was baited on all occasions alike by the enemies and former friends of presbytery with the Act of the West Kirk and the Declaration of Dunfermline, which had been reprinted in London, and he added, "Our noblemen of any worth are fast enough against episcopacy among us, but I suspect some of them are so upon a state interest rather than conscience, and all incline to bring our church government to a

⁴ Wodrow, Hist., 1.38-9, 40, 41.

subordination

to the civil power." Douglas replied defending the part which he himself had taken in the matter of the Declaration of Dunfermline and the Act of the West Kirk, and blaming the Protesters for overwhelming the opposition of the moderates. He gave the assurance that in future Assemblies would not mingle civil matters with ecclesiastical, and he asked that the King should be informed that after the Protesters separated from them the proceedings of the Assembly had nothing to do with civil affairs. He understood very well the implication that a church ruled by a General Assembly which had the power to pass such acts would be a danger to the King's authority, and he was anxious to convince the King that an Assembly free from the presence of extremists would prove that presbytery was consistent with monarchy. During the Protectorate he had been against the calling of an Assembly so long as differences existed in the church. Now, if presbytery was to continue, there must be an Assembly united in support of the King's authority. That could only be obtained by the exclusion of the Protesters.⁵

Lauderdale, who was the King's friend and had considerable influence with him in Scottish affairs, believed that the Scottish nation was attached to presbytery and so strongly opposed to episcopacy that the imposition of that form of church government would alienate their affections from the King and cause such discontent as to weaken his authority. He, therefore, advocated a presbyterian settlement ~~settlement~~ and the summoning of a General Assembly. He was no less desirous than the other nobles of subordinating the

5. Wodrow, Hist., i.44-7; Reg. Consult., ii.216; Stephen, Life of Sharp, 60.

church to the state, and he doubtless thought it would be possible to manage the elections of members to the Assembly in such a way that only moderate men ready to show their loyalty to the King would be chosen. It is probable that Sharp at this time was doing his best to help Lauderdale to carry out his aims. He seems to have tried to win over Douglas to support an erastian settlement. Writing from London on July 3rd, he informed him that he had let Hyde know of his services to the King and that several of the King's advisers had praised his influence in the direction of moderation, adding, "The Lord preserve you long among us, for great will the need be we will have of you in those most ticklish times which are coming upon us."⁶ Knowing, however, the strong views held by Douglas he may have had his doubts about the possibility of inducing him to make all the concessions the King desired, and he must have been aware that it would not be easy to convince the King and his advisers that the Scottish ministers would continue to be submissive. The actions of Scottish presbyterians in their Assemblies during his stay in Scotland had made such an impression on the mind of the King that even after the establishment of episcopacy the National Synod, whose constitution was settled by parliamentary enactment, was never allowed to meet. It also seems probable that Sharp had made up his mind that, if he became convinced that it was the King's intention to restore episcopacy, he would co-operate to that end, and that he was making this clear to Hyde, Middleton and the English bishops. In the same circumstances Lauderdale was prepared to abandon the cause of

6. Wodrow, Hist., i.49; Reg. Consult., ii.213.

presbytery, but he had more faith in his power to influence the King than had Sharp, and he was hostile to Hyde and Middleton.

Lauderdale and Sharp had many consultations with Cassillis and Lorne. It was considered ~~best~~ that the General Assembly should meet after the parliament, for, if it met before, it would have no authority, and it was feared it would deal too leniently with the Protesters, for parliament meant to take up the matter of the Remonstrance. Lauderdale and Sharp were of opinion that the King^{should} acknowledge the lawfulness of the Assembly at St. Andrews of 1651, which would prevent the election of Protesters unless they renounced their principles. It had been suggested that the King should summon the Assembly of 1653, forcibly dissolved by Lilburne, at which no Protesters had been present, instead of a freely elected Assembly, but it was thought ~~the king~~^{he} might not be willing to recognise that Assembly since it had been held after the interruption of his government in Scotland. Sharp now impressed upon Douglas that the strongest argument which could be used to gain the King's consent to an Assembly would be to inform the king that it would be the best way to vindicate his authority and the only way for honest ministers to show their loyalty towards the king's interest. By its means also they would be able to show that presbyterian government did not encroach upon civil authority. In his reply Douglas repeated the assurance he had already given that there was no fear that the church judicatories would interfere with civil affairs, and that, when the King granted a General Assembly, it would be seen how consistent presbytery was with monarchy.⁷

7. Wodrow, Hist., i., 44, 45, 47, 51; Reg. Consult. ii. 216-7.

On July 14th the King summoned Sharp to his closet and promised that a letter would be written in a day or two. On the 16th the letter was read to him ~~on the 16th~~ in Sharp's presence and approved. Sharp wrote to Douglas giving him its substance and expressing the opinion that it was all that could be desired in the circumstances. He rejoiced that his work had come to an end, and he claimed that he had asserted the cause of the kirk to the King and others, had pleaded for pity and compassion to the opposing faction and had said nothing that savoured of severity or revenge.⁸ With regard to a General Assembly the King had told him that he could not yet decide upon the time, but he readily agreed to own the Assembly at St. Andrews of 1651 as the best means of showing his approval of the Resolutioners. On July 26th, however, Sharp wrote that several Scotsmen were not satisfied with the King's declaration that he would preserve the government of the church as settled by law, and he had been advised to postpone his journey home for two or three days that he might take care that the King's assurance in the letter be made good by instructions to the Committee of Estates. Writing on August 2nd Douglas expressed his complete satisfaction with Sharp's account of the King's letter and begged Sharp to hasten home with it, adding that when he arrived he would understand the need for his speedy coming.⁹

On Saturday, August 11th, the King's letter was written by Lauderdale's hand, signed by Lauderdale as Secretary for Scotland,

8. Cf. below, pp. 98, 108.

9. Wodrow, Hist., i. 51-2; Reg. Consult., ii. 220.

and superscribed by the King that evening. It passed the Signet the following Monday, and at last it was possible for Sharp to take leave of the King and make arrangements to return to Scotland. He delayed in London for a few days longer in order to have the company of others on his journey home, for he had been informed that the way was dangerous and he did not venture to post owing to the excessively hot weather. He arrived in Edinburgh on August 31st.¹⁰

Sharp had been in London for five and a half months, with the exception of three weeks spent in Holland. During that period a complete revolution had taken place in English affairs. He had been in daily contact with many of the leading actors in that revolution and had shared the confidence of some of them. His powers of observation were acute, and he was skilled in reading the motives of men. He had learned many things -- among them that it was possible to interpret the Solemn League and Covenant as consistent with moderate episcopacy, that the King was determined that the Church of Scotland should be subordinate to the state, that all the Scottish presbyterian nobility would support him wholeheartedly in this determination, and that none was prepared to oppose whatever settlement he should decide to make. ^{Sharp} ~~He~~ had told Douglas that some of the nobles desired that episcopacy should be restored in Scotland and that others professed presbytery for reasons of state and were aiming at an erastian settlement. He knew that the former party, led by Middleton, was supported by Hyde, who exercised a greater

influence over the king than any other man, and that the King doubted whether presbytery and a General Assembly could be compatible with the royal prerogative. He had laboured with Lauderdale to draft the King's letter in such a way that it would satisfy the leading Resolutioners and at the same time make it very clear that the King would not tolerate any interference by the church in civil affairs. After his return to Scotland it was to be his business to interpret the letter to the Scottish ministers and to secure that the replies of the synods and presbyteries would be pleasing to the King and contain no awkward references to the Solemn League and Covenant.

In Scotland royalist feeling had been very strong from the first, and with the exception of the Protesters, the whole population looked forward eagerly to the King's restoration: but these royalists were not a homogeneous body and different classes had different hopes and fears. According to Robert Douglas the nation was divided into three parties who had all their own fears in the crisis -- the Protesters who feared the King's restoration, those who hated the Covenant and feared the coming in of the King on Covenant terms, and those who loved religion and the liberty of the nation, who feared the consequences to both if he did not come in on Covenant terms.¹¹

It is hardly possible to estimate the numbers in each class. Doubtless the mass of the population were indifferent to the

11. Wodrow, Hist., i.16.

Covenants and the form of church government, desiring only to be allowed to pursue the interests of their daily lives in peace. The majority of the nobility and gentry tended towards episcopacy, and the townsmen and the clergy were probably more evenly divided. The Protesters are believed to have been about a third of the ministers. The remaining two thirds were the Resolutioners, but not all of them were devoted to the Covenants. The majority of the leading men among them were genuine covenanters, but there were even among these some moderates who did not consider the question of church government fundamental--of these the most prominent were Sharp himself and the majority of the first appointed bishops. In the ranks were many who had taken the Covenants for the sake of maintaining their positions and securing the livelihood of themselves and their families. These last were more numerous in the north, and episcopacy was popular there among the people generally. In the western districts of the lowlands and in Argyll the Protesters predominated and they were zealously supported by their congregations. In Fife and Lothian also there were a number of Protesters, but they were not in the majority, and there were many Resolutioners of the faithful type of Douglas himself. This was the part of the country with which Douglas had for long been best acquainted, and he had some admissions to make regarding it. On March 31st he wrote to Sharp, "There is now a generation risen up, which have never been acquainted with the work of reformation, nor with the just proceedings of this

nation and therefore would condemn them, the covenant and all their honest and loyal actings according to covenant principles," and again, on April 21st, "The generality of the new upstart generation have no love of presbyterial government, but are wearied of that yoke, feeding themselves with the fancy of episcopacy, or moderate episcopacy."

Douglas's statements are confirmed by the contemporary historian, Kirkton, who wrote that a great part of the nation had made defection from the Covenant.¹²

The breach between Protesters and Resolutioners remained as wide as ever. From the beginning of Monck's adventure the Resolutioners had two fears regarding the Protesters. They were afraid on the one hand that such of the Protesters as had obtained high positions under the usurpers might be maintained in them and so be able to continue to trouble the peace of the church; on the other hand they feared that they themselves might be compromised by the actions of the Protesters, if they did not take pains to disclaim any sympathy with them. Johnston of Warriston, who had been a member of the Committee of Safety and had actively supported the army against the parliament, was still in London when Sharp arrived there in February. Although he had been a determined opponent of Sharp in his former missions to London, he asked him to use his influence with Monck that he might keep the offices he held in Scotland, have his debts paid and have Monck's personal protection. Sharp declined to interfere, and Douglas wrote in strong approval of his attitude.

12. Wodrow, Hist., i.15, 21; Kirkton, Hist., 70.

Again ~~and~~ when he wrote to congratulate Crawford Lindsay and Lauderdale on their release from prison, he warned them against admitting Protesters to their council or to public employment. One of the instructions the Edinburgh ministers sent to Sharp in Holland was that the King might be informed that the principles of the Protesters were such that, if they were given any positions of authority or influence, the divisions in the church would be perpetuated, but at the same time they wished that no injury should be done to their persons and that the King would show them clemency. Robert Baillie and some others appear to have made some advances to the Protesters in April or May 1660, but the latter persisted in claiming for themselves the right, as the godly party, to refuse to obey the decision of the majority in presbytery and synod if it did not meet with their approval. Thus the movement towards conciliation came to nothing.¹³

After the Restoration the Resolutioners in their sermons proclaimed their joy at the King's return, while the Protesters, though they "had some prayers for the King", aimed at filling the people with fear of the restoration of episcopacy. The news of the proposed accommodation between the English presbyterians and the episcopalians caused, according to reports received in London, Scottish pulpits to ring with denunciations, and Douglas's sermons were particularly mentioned. In fact he and the other Edinburgh ministers confined themselves to praying that the English church

13. Wodrow, Hist., i.10,12,16,18,22,24n.; Reg. Consult., ii.194
Clarke Papers, iv., pp.xxiv,80,100; Baillie, L. & J., iii.404 -
 Cf. Wodrow, Hist., i.62.

might be settled according to the word of God and the King and the English parliament directed aright. Douglas declared that he had not preached against prelacy in England, but he had preached in favour of presbyterian government in Scotland, which he considered very necessary in view of the temper of many in both countries. He had also found it necessary to vindicate the King against charges that he intended to introduce episcopacy into Scotland.¹⁴

Some men were disturbed by the arrest of Argyll in London on July 8th and of Sir James Stuart, Lord Provost of Edinburgh, and Sir John Chiesly on the 14th and the issue of a warrant for the seizure of Warriston, and in spite of Sharp's assurances to the contrary there were persistent rumours of the intended restoration of episcopacy in Scotland. There was a report that Lauderdale attended Common Prayer and joined in the service. It had been spread, according to Sharp, by Mrs. Gillespie, who was in London seeking to secure her husband's safety and that he might retain his position as Principal of Glasgow University. Sharp's interviews with the episcopal clergy, Hyde and other members of the episcopal party were noticed. Douglas knew of them and agreed with Sharp that they were necessary to the success of his mission, but the Protesters were very suspicious of him and ready to believe the worst of him. Even among the Resolutioners there were some who doubted the wisdom of the decision to refrain from interference in the religious settlement in England. Robert Baillie wrote to Hutcheson on August 13th,

14. Baillie, L. & J., iii.404; Wodrow, Hist., i.44, 47.

"I am not pleased with what is so often inculcat to you from London, that the more we medle with the kirk of England it will fare the worse both with us and them. What is the Scots of this, but that we shall sitt dumb and never open our mouth, neither to the King nor Parliament, to request them to adhere to their covenant and Petition against Books and Bishops?" Douglas, who knew the substance of the King's letter, was now very anxious for Sharp's return with it, for he was sure it would satisfy all reasonable men.¹⁵

Before the end of July Sharp had informed Douglas of the names of those who were to hold the chief offices in the Scottish government. Middleton was to be Commissioner, Glencairn Lord Chancellor, Crawford Lindsay Lord Treasurer, Lauderdale Secretary, Sir Archibald Primrose, Lord Clerk Register and Sir John Fletcher Advocate. The choice of Middleton as Commissioner was not altogether pleasing to presbyterians, but they must have been re-assured by the appointment of Lauderdale as Secretary, since he would reside in London and have the ear of the King. Crawford Lindsay was thoroughly trusted and Glencairn was believed to be loyal to presbytery. The Resolutioners cannot have anticipated any danger to religion from the Committee of Estates, since they had worked in harmony with them after the passing of the Public Resolutions.¹⁶

The Protesters, for their part, were not at all satisfied. They had failed more than once to persuade the Resolutioners to join

15. Wodrow, Hist., i.17, 50, 51; Baillie, L. & J., iii.408-9; L.P., i.58, ii.p.lxxi.

16. Wodrow, Hist., i.50, 51.

them in a petition to the King, and they now decided to act on their own responsibility. On August 23rd, the date of the first sitting of the Committee of Estates, a number of their leading men, including James Guthrie, met at the house of Robert Simpson in Edinburgh. They had prepared a draft of an address to the King in which they reminded him of his coronation oath, asked him to preserve presbyterianism in Scotland, to establish it in England and Ireland, to fill all places of trust in his government with men who had taken the Covenant, and to discontinue the use of the service book in his chapel and elsewhere in England. This draft they intended to submit to a larger meeting to be held in Glasgow in September. If they had been allowed to do what they intended and if the petition had been adopted by a large body of ministers in the west, the plans of Lauderdale and the moderates would have been immediately upset and a state of turmoil would probably have arisen. The government suspected them of aiming at rebellion, and the Committee of Estates on learning the contents of the draft ordered all who had been present at the meeting to be arrested. The majority were taken and imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle, and on the following day a proclamation was issued forbidding unlawful meetings and seditious petitions.¹⁷

The Resolutioners were not sorry to see the Protesters firmly dealt with, but many must have felt that they were merely showing loyalty to the Covenant by which they themselves were bound.

17. Wodrow, Hist., i. 47, 51, 66-75, 68n-71n; Reg. Consult. ii. 217; Row, Life of Blair, 359.

Indeed the substance of the petition differed very little from that of the representations which the Edinburgh ministers had asked Sharp to make to the King. Thus a state of some uneasiness existed in Edinburgh at the time of Sharp's arrival there. The day after he returned he delivered the King's letter to Robert Douglas in the presence of the Edinburgh brethren and gave an account of his mission. The brethren blessed the Lord for its success and gave Sharp hearty thanks for his great pains and care. The presbytery of Edinburgh met on Monday, September 3rd, to hear the contents of the letter. They expressed their satisfaction and ordered the letter to be printed and distributed to the other presbyteries.¹⁸

The terms of the letter appeared to the Resolutioners to grant them all that they desired. The King promised to protect and preserve the government of the church of Scotland "as it is by law established without violation;" to take care that the General Assembly at St. Andrews and Dundee, 1551, be owned and stand in force until he should call another General Assembly, which he intended to do as soon as possible. He also declared his intention to send for Mr. Robert Douglas and some ministers that he might discuss with them any other affairs of the church. He expressed satisfaction with their resolution not to meddle without their sphere and his expectation that church judicatories and ministers in Scotland would confine themselves to ecclesiastical matters and promote his authority with his subjects against all opposers, and that they would take special notice of any who by preaching or private conventicles, or any other

18. Reg. Consult., i. 221.

way, transgressed the limits of their calling. The Resolutioners generally were satisfied and relieved of their fears. Sharp wrote to Lauderdale on September 12th that the excitement caused by the arrest of the Protester ministers had begun to die down, pulpits resounded with thanksgiving and rejoicing and he had heard that ^a ~~the~~ Protester minister of Ayr had given public thanks for the King's letter.¹⁹

Sharp now bestirred himself to secure a good reception for the letter and to re-assure such of the Resolutioners and non-party men as might still entertain some fears. He admitted that there were influential Scots at the King's court who were working to introduce episcopacy into Scotland, but he constantly asserted that the King was resolved not to change the government of the church. This resolution he showed to have been the result of Lauderdale's efforts and his friends made it clear that his own exertions had been important in preventing the success of those who desired to overturn the existing church settlement. By Sharp's advice the presbytery of Edinburgh sent a letter of thanks to Lauderdale as well as to the King, and the majority of the synods returned their addresses to the King through Lauderdale.

In the Synod of Fife, which met at Kirkaldy early in October, Sharp met with some opposition from members who wished to mention the Covenant in their reply to the King's letter. He argued that that would be equivalent to agreeing with the petition

19. Wodrow, Hist., i.80-84; L.P., ii.p.lxxi.

of the Protesters arrested on August 23rd. He informed them that there was no one in England who interpreted the Solemn League and Covenant as they did in Scotland and that those in that country who professed to accept the Covenant considered that a moderate episcopacy was consistent with it. Owing to the strong support of James Wood and Frederick Carmichael he obtained the unanimous consent *of the meeting* to the letter which was sent to Lauderdale, but there were some who thought he spoke too slightly of the Covenant. When Robert Blair, who had been absent from the meeting through illness, was given a report of the discussion and of Sharp's speeches, his comment was, "I now see the knave and his tricks; I am sorry that honest Mr. Wood is so deluded by him." ²⁰

Sharp gave Lauderdale his account of the discussion in a letter of October 12th, "Remonstrating and indifferent men were convinced after some debate about the waving in this returne the mentioning of the covenant, and about the G. Assembly of St. Andrews and Dundee, which we evinced ought to be specially noticed, because that assembly had asserted dogmatical points formerly questioned, viz. that which the resolutioners hold forth about conjunction in arms, disannulling of the act of classes, and repealing the act made at the west kirk and asserting the magistrates power of confining ministers in cases of treason and sedition." At the same time he again expressed his satisfaction with the effect of the ~~king's~~ letter upon the church as a whole - "His Majesty's letter

20. Row, Life of Blair, 362-4.

has more effectually contributed to his Majesty's interest and service in Scotland than he could have imagined; remonstrators except some fanatics are silenced; the profane contemners of discipline are reduced to a dreadour of it; generally the ministers everywhere preach, pray and speak up the king in that strain which some years ago would have been deemed rank malignancy."²¹

In view of the strong influences in favour of episcopacy the Resolutioner ministers seem to have come to the conclusion that their only hope lay in the King. They trusted Lauderdale, who had the King's ear, and they believed his and Sharp's assurances of the King's good intentions. Both Lauderdale and Sharp, however, made a reservation when they gave this assurance. "We need fear no violation of our settlement here," Sharp wrote to Baillie on September 5th, "if the lord give us to prize our own mercie and know our dutie." Lauderdale wrote to Douglas and Hutcheson that if ministers did their duty he could answer for the King's fulfilling his promise.²² That duty was to uphold the King's prerogative, to disown the doctrine of 1648 and 1649 and take measures to exclude the extremists from any influence. Douglas seems to have been prepared to admit that the ~~that the~~ actions of the Assemblies of 1648 and 1649 were in some particulars unreasonable, but it is doubtful if he would have been prepared to disown the principles upon which they acted, for the rigid presbyterians had no criticism

21. N.L.S. MS.2512

22. Baillie, L. & J.,ii.410; Wodrow MS.Fol.xxvi.69 (C. of S.)

to offer of his public utterances and sermons such as that they made of those of Sharp.²³

The leading Resolutioners had no doubt that a General Assembly would give the King proof that presbytery was consistent with monarchy. The King had now promised an Assembly but had not fixed the date. Douglas had agreed that it could not be held till after the parliament. Sharp wrote to Lauderdale on October 15th, "All are convinced of the necessity of calling it both for establishing the King's authority ^{by our own consent,} and for the peace of the church, though we think it cannot conveniently meet till after the parliament." He asked that the proclamation for summoning it might be sent immediately with a blank for the time, and suggested that the King should appoint Lauderdale as Commissioner. He declared this to be the desire of all honest ministers who were of opinion that Lauderdale more than any other would be useful to the King and to the church. Lauderdale had a proclamation drafted and sent to Sharp's brother, William, now Lauderdale's agent in Scotland and Deputy Keeper of the Signet under him, and it was considered by Douglas, Hutcheson and a few trusted brethren. In a letter to Lauderdale of November 10th some amendments were suggested to the clauses which were aimed against the Protesters, on the ground that some expressions were over harsh. They also asked for a reconstruction of the clause which forbade the Protesters to sit in any judicatory until they

23. Cf. below p. 119.

renounced their pernicious opinions, pointing out that in the Church of Scotland all ministers, so long as they were not deposed or suspended, were members of sessions, presbyteries and synods by virtue of their office.²⁴ This was an assertion of the right of the church to retain her constitution unaltered.

Nevertheless the same letter showed that the policy of the Resolutioners towards the extremists was to be guided by the desires of the King. Lauderdale was informed that the Synod of Lothian, which had just met, had taken action to deal with those who had been engaged in schismatical ways and had adjourned until the result had been reported to them. At the same time they advised clemency to those who had been misled by their leaders and were willing to give up their former ways. Sharp reported on December 13th that they had deposed one minister, suspended another and induced most of the other offenders to express their repentance for their opposition to the King. He added that Douglas was anxious that the King should be assured that no minister within the provinces of Lothian and Fife, or, they hoped, in any other, would be tolerated who did not disown everything he had ever spoken in prejudice of the King's authority. According to the covenanting historian, Kirkton, this policy was carried out thoroughly wherever the Resolutioners were in the majority, and if the later sessions of the synods had not been interrupted by the introduction

24. N.L.S. MS.2512; Wodrow MS.Fol.xxvi.69 (C.of S.); L.P.,i.35-6; Wodrow, Hist.,i.86.

of episcopacy most of the ministers later ejected for nonconformity would have been deposed by their own brethren.²⁵

At the same time energetic action was being taken against prominent leaders by the state. Since the arrest of the petitioners of August 23rd others had been imprisoned, including Patrick Gillespie and James Simpson of Airth, Sharp's old opponent before Cromwell. Proceedings were also begun against Samuel Rutherford. A proclamation was issued on September 19th against his Lex Rex and The Causes of God's Wrath, of which Guthrie was the reputed author. On October 16th copies of these two works were burned publicly in Edinburgh by the common hangman.²⁶ The Resolutioner ministers made efforts to save the lives of those who were accused of capital offences and for clemency for the others. Sharp claimed that he had pleaded for pity and pardon for the Protesters with the king at Breda, and later that he had tried to obtain indulgence for Rutherford, as Robert Blair was well aware. Early in the following year he pleaded with the authorities for clemency to the Protester ministers and got six of those ordered to be cited before parliament "scraped off the roll." Then also Douglas, Sharp and others asked Lauderdale to use his influence on behalf of Guthrie, but Sharp felt that Guthrie's obstinacy excused him from further efforts. Nevertheless, when he was in London the following summer, he asked at his first interview with the king that the lives of Guthrie and Gillespie

25. L.P., i. 54; Kirkton, Hist., 75; Cf. Row, Life of Blair, 367.

26. Wodrow, Hist., 75, 79-80; Lamont's Diary, 126.

might be spared. The king refused this request, but he promised that James Simpson, who had written to Sharp asking for his help, should not be tried for his life. Robert Baillie did not want to see the Protesters deprived of their means of livelihood, and he suggested that they should be sent to parishes in Orkney, "where they might preach and live." He had completed a pamphlet pointing out the error of their ways, but he was anxious that it should not be published until the parliament and even the church had finished dealing with them.²⁷

Rumours, probably ill-founded, were prevalent that Lauderdale was inclined to favour the Protesters, and Robert Baillie even feared that through his influence Patrick Gillespie might be allowed to retain his position as Principal of Glasgow University. Lauderdale energetically denied these reports, and on Sharp's strong recommendation secured Baillie's appointment in Gillespie's stead.²⁸ Lauderdale owed some gratitude to Gillespie, who during the last year of Lauderdale's imprisonment in Windsor Castle had used his influence with Lambert to secure the continuation of Lauderdale's pension, previously granted by the government, but for some time unpaid. Possibly Sharp feared that gratitude might have some influence with Lauderdale, for he took great pains to show him in his letters how dangerous to the king's authority were

27. Reg. Consult., ii.220; L.P., i.41; 84, 78; Laing MSS. (H.M.C.) i.319; Wodrow MS. 8vo xi., 7 (N.L.S.); Baillie, L. & J., iii.415, 417. Rutherford died in March 1661 before the date fixed for his trial Gillespie recanted, and through the influence of powerful friends was liberated, but was confined to the parish of Ormiston and six miles round it. Guthrie was executed on June 1st, 1661.

28. Wodrow, Hist., i.192, 205, 206; Baillie, L. & J., iii.407-8, 411; L.P., i.59.ii, pp. lxxvii-iii.

the writings and speeches of the Protesters.²⁹

Lauderdale was also suspected of feeling too kindly towards the Marquis of Argyll, whose royalist son, Lord Lorne, was his friend. The Resolutioners hoped that Argyll's life would be spared, remembering his past services to the kirk, although they had disapproved of his later actions. Douglas had asked Sharp towards the end of his stay in London to give the lady Argyll all the comfort and assistance he could when she came up to see her lord, and Sharp wrote on August 11th that he had visited her.³⁰ The leading politicians in Scotland, however, thought Argyll too dangerous to be allowed to live, and Sharp, in his letter of October 15th gave Lauderdale a hint that he was believed to be using his influence in his favour, "It is written from London by some related to the marquis of Argyll that through the solicitations of the triumviri for Scots affairs there (who these are is left to conjecture, but sure your Lop is one) he is like to scape scotsfree and scart free, the parson of Flisk³¹ tells it me as the sense of others, y^t if this report^{be} true^{be} both himself and others conclude themselves destroyed and the king's service in this kingdom wholly undermined and dissapoynted."³²

It is difficult to judge how far Sharp's propaganda efforts were successful with the leading Resolutioners. They took action with the Protesters and they refrained from mentioning the Solemn League and Covenant in their addresses to the king. To insist upon

29. L.P., i. 59, ii. pp. lxxii-iii; N.L.S., MS. 2512.

30. Baillie, L. & J., iii. 465-6; Wodrow, i. 51, 52; Stephen, Life of

31. The Earl of Rothes. L.P., i. p. ix.

Sharp, 78.

32. N.L.S. MS. 2512

their loyalty to it was not a matter of practical importance, since the English refused to accept presbytery. Nevertheless they still felt themselves bound by it, and the King's proclamation of October 25th declaring his intention of restoring episcopacy in England caused distress to many. Robert Baillie thought that the Edinburgh ministers ought to have taken some steps in the matter, but since they had done nothing he felt he should write himself to the London ministers, Messrs. Ashe and Clerk, to urge them to do their best to get up a strong petition from the presbyterian ministers and the City against episcopacy and the liturgy. He wrote to George Hutcheson on November 5th asking for his approval. He had recently visited Edinburgh, and he was shocked by what he heard and saw there. He feared that the harsh treatment of the Protesters might have been designed to weaken the kirk, and that parliament would abolish the Act of Patronages and meddle with the Solemn League and Covenant with the connivance and silence of the ministers. He asked Hutcheson to consult with Dickson, Douglas, Wood and Sharp to prevent this from happening. Hutcheson seems to have advised him against writing to London and to have informed Sharp of the contents of the letter, for Sharp wrote to him on December 13th that he was confident parliament would not meddle with the concerns of the church.³³

On this date Crawford Lindsay arrived in Edinburgh from London in view of the meeting of parliament at the beginning of January. He informed Sharp of certain rumours which were then

current about him in London, and Sharp received a letter on the same subject about the same time from his old friend, Patrick Drummond, who was still in touch with Lauderdale. It was being said that while Sharp was in England he had plotted with Middleton and the leading episcopal clergy to secure the introduction of episcopacy into Scotland, that he was still in communication with them, that he had been speaking with ministers in Scotland who were disloyal to presbytery and that he had spoken against Lauderdale to the King. In his answer to this letter Sharp defended himself at length denying all the charges. He pointed to his conduct since his return to Scotland as proof of his integrity and his loyalty to Lauderdale in that he had laboured to obtain grateful answers to the King's letter from synods and presbyteries and due acknowledgement of Lauderdale's services to the kirk. He laid great stress on the difficulty and inexpediency of any attempt to introduce episcopacy into Scotland. He had not, he said, either in Scotland or in England declaimed against the government of the Church of England; and with regard to the Scottish church in speaking with the episcopal clergy he had admitted that the actions of the extremists had brought suspicion upon its government, but he had declared his own conviction that the King's authority would be restored under a moderate presbyterian government, and had added that, if he were not convinced of this, he would disclaim presbyterian government. A report of this last statement might well have produced the rumours, for it might be interpreted to mean that he was looking for reasons for abandoning presbytery. He was certainly at this time studying

the literature against the Covenant,³⁴ and he may have had some idea of Middleton's intentions. However, Drummond seems to have been reassured by Sharp's letters. He took pains to contradict the rumours and Lauderdale wrote personally to Sharp that he had given no credence to them.³⁵

34. L.P.i.43.

35. Ibid. i.45-56; S.H.S. Misc., i.248-9.

The Earl of Middleton arrived in Edinburgh at the end of December and the first session of parliament began on January 1st, 1661. Middleton is said to have had from the King, at the instance of Clarendon, a secret instruction not communicated to Lauderdale to try the inclinations of the nation for episcopacy, and to consider of the method of setting it up. His official instructions were that the royal prerogative should be asserted and the just liberties of the people settled as they enjoyed them under the King's royal ancestors according to law. For that purpose the

Convention of Estates VI 1643 and the Parliament of 1649 were to be declared null, for they had both been summoned without the King's authority. Since 1643, enactments which had met with the King's authority certain acts had been passed during the late troubles which antedated upon the prerogative, these acts were to be repealed.¹

The official instruction, though they did not mention religion, certainly made it possible for Middleton to open the way for the settlement of episcopacy. The Parliament of 1649 had ratified the Solemn League and Covenant, that of 1653 had passed the act abolishing episcopacy, and the act ratifying the National Covenant might be regarded as establishing the royal authority. Being partly to the strong separatist reaction and partly to the management of the effective by the government Middleton was likely to find no great difficulty in carrying out his orders.

1. Burnet, *Own Times*, i. 100, 101, 102, 103.
2. Baillie, *Life of James Baillie*, Glasgow, 1844, ix.

The Earl of Middleton arrived in Edinburgh at the end of December and the first session of parliament began on January 1st, 1661. Middleton is said to have had from the King, at the instance of Clarendon, a secret instruction not communicated to Lauderdale "to try the inclinations of the nation for episcopacy, and to consider of the ^{best} methods in setting it up." His official instructions were that the royal prerogative should be asserted and the just liberties of the people settled as they enjoyed them under the King's royal ancestors according to law. For that purpose the Convention of Estates of 1643 and the Parliament of 1649 were to be declared null, for they had both been summoned without the King's authority. Since in other Parliaments which had met with the King's authority certain acts had been passed during the late troubles which entrenched upon the prerogative, these acts were to be repealed.¹

The official instructions, though they did not mention religion, certainly made it possible for Middleton to open the way for the settlement of episcopacy, for the Parliament of 1643 had ratified the Solemn League and Covenant, that of 1649 had passed the act abolishing patronage and the act ratifying the National Covenant might be regarded as entrenching on the royal authority. Owing partly to the strong royalist re-action and partly to the management of the elections by the government² Middleton was likely to find no great difficulty in carrying out his orders.

1. Burnet, Own Times, i.199-200; L.P., i.39.

2. Baillie, L. & J., iii.463; Mackenzie, Memoirs, 12.

He met, however, with some opposition from members of the Scottish government itself. Lauderdale, the Secretary, and Crawford Lindsay, the Lord Treasurer, both desired to maintain presbytery and were opposed to any legislation which would destroy the basis of the existing church settlement. Middleton had the support of the Earl of Glencairn, the Lord Chancellor, and of Sir Archibald Primrose, the Lord Clerk Register. The Earl of Rothes, who was to be President of the Privy Council, was the friend of Lauderdale and was believed to be presbyterian, but he was won over to the support of Middleton during this session.

Before Sharp left London at the end of the preceding August ~~he~~ had been appointed royal chaplain in Scotland, and in virtue of this office he was invited to officiate daily at the Commissioner's table.³ Thus he came into close contact with those who were carrying out the King's policy and was at hand if advice should be required on church matters. He repeatedly asserted, nevertheless, that he was not consulted on legislation.

At the beginning of January Middleton had a talk with Robert Douglas and assured him that he had no instructions to change the government of the church, an assurance which Douglas believed. During January Sharp repeatedly declared that he knew of no purpose to interfere with the church, and on April 15th he wrote to Lauderdale that up to six weeks from the beginning of the session Middleton had informed him that there was no such intention.⁴ There can be little doubt, however, that before the

3. L.P., i. 61.
4. Wodrow, Hist., i. 227; L.P., i. 291, 292-3; N.L.S. MS. 2512.

end of January Sharp was privy to Middleton's plans, and that the King and Clarendon knew it. While he was in London the following May assisting to make arrangements for the settlement of episcopacy he wrote of a letter of his own dated in January which Clarendon had found useful.⁵ It seems probable also that this visit to London had been planned very early, for on January 31st he wrote to Patrick Drummond⁶ that he might have occasion to wait upon Lauderdale in London in the summer from the University of St. Andrews, where he was about to be admitted as Professor of Divinity.⁷

Sharp's chief share in the work of preparation seems to have been to reassure the Resolutioners and to prevent them from petitioning Parliament regarding its legislation in order that it might be possible to represent to the King that there was no real opposition to episcopacy except on the part of the Protesters, who were regarded as disloyal. At the same time he was warning Lauderdale that it was the intention in the highest quarters to bring in episcopacy and insinuating that the majority of ministers would accept it. Thus there was an apparent change in his views since December 13th, when he expressed the opinion that no considerable party among the ministers would support episcopacy and stated

5. L.P.,ii.p.lxxviii.

6. Sharp kept Lauderdale informed regarding all legislation which might affect the church and the attitude of ministers to it mainly by letters to Patrick Drummond, which were intended to be shown to Lauderdale, partly to save him trouble and partly because letters directed to Lauderdale were liable to be opened.
L.P.,i.82,90.

7. Ibid. i.71.

that Rothes agreed with him. Rothes was now taking up Sharp's new position, and it seems probable that there had been a good understanding between them for some time. Both appear to have made up their minds not to commit themselves until they were sure which side would win and both were anxious to reconcile Middleton and Lauderdale.⁸

At the beginning of the session Sharp was full of praises of Middleton's wisdom and moderation, and Robert Baillie, who visited Edinburgh to pay his respects from Glasgow University to the Commissioner, found no reason to doubt that he possessed these qualities. According to his account Middleton at first made an excellent impression on people generally. Baillie, however, saw much that he did not like in Edinburgh. "Many of our people," he wrote to his cousin, Spang, at Rotterdam, "are hankering after bishops-----an exceeding great profanitie and contempt of the ministrie and of religion itself is everywhere prevalent; and a young fry of ministers in Lothian and Fife and elsewhere looks as if they intended some change."⁹ There was some truth in Sharp's reports to Lauderdale.

Robert Douglas preached to Parliament at its opening. Sharp preached to them twice on the first Sunday, January 6th, and thereafter different ministers were appointed for each Sunday during the session. Sharp's sermons pleased Parliament so much that he was asked to print them. He took care, however, to avoid doing

8. L.P., i.44-5, 91.

9. Ibid. i.61; Baillie, L. & J., iii.420, 443-4.

so, as it would have been necessary to dedicate them to the Commissioner, and that, he feared, would make him subject to suspicion. He was, indeed, criticised by the rigid presbyterians, who accused him of reflecting on the Solemn League and Covenant and the proceedings of church and state during the last twenty years. Among his critics was Lady Margaret Kennedy, daughter of the Earl of Cassillis and friend and correspondent of Lauderdale, who had strong sympathies with the covenanters. Douglas, Smith, Wood and other Resolutioner ministers were reported by Sharp to be satisfied with the account they received of his sermons, and both the King and Lauderdale thoroughly approved and wished to receive copies when they were published. Sharp had decided not to publish, but he promised to have a copy written and sent to Patrick Drummond. Douglas's sermon was less pleasing to the Parliament because they thought he had justified the proceedings of the church since 1648, which Sharp declared to be a misunderstanding.¹⁰ The presbyterian critics thought it a "very pertinent and honest sermon," and the preaching of Sharp's associates, Smith, Wood and Hutcheson was also approved by them. The addresses of some other ministers were thought to point towards episcopacy and it was believed that they had been invited to preach because of their leanings in that direction.¹¹ Sharp later assured Lauderdale that he had nothing to do with the giving of invitations to preach except in the cases of James Wood and Andrew Honyman, who had originally been left out of the list.¹²

10. L.P., i.61,65; Row, Life of Blair, 371,374; S.H.S.Misc., i.248; N.L.S. MS.98, f.64.

11. Row, Life of Blair, 371,374,8; Baillie, L.&J., iii.468; Burnet, Own

12. N.L.S.MS.2512, f.6. Times, i.217.

Parliament at once began the work of carrying out Middleton's instructions to assert the King's prerogative. First it was enacted that all members should take an "oath of Parliament" which included an acknowledgement of the King as only supreme governor of the kingdom over all persons and in all causes. It was explained to members by the Commissioner and the Chancellor that in taking this oath they acknowledged the King's supreme power in civil, but not ecclesiastical, causes. The Earl of Cassillis and the Laird of Kilburny asked that this interpretation should be entered in the registers of Parliament, but their request was refused. The Earls of Cassillis and Melville and the laird of Kilburny, therefore, declined to take the oath. On January 2nd was passed the first rescissory act annulling the Convention of Estates of 1643 and rescinding any acts ratifying it. On the 25th a more definite step was taken by the "act concerning the league and covenant, and discharging the renewing thereof without his Majesty's warrant and approbation!" The latter part of the act was occasioned, according to Sharp, by the fact that the Synod of the West had passed a resolution in support of the Solemn League and Covenant and had had copies printed and sent to Ireland.¹³

In view of Middleton's assurances some of the ministers were taken aback by this legislation, and there seems to have been some opposition to it in Parliament. Sharp at first expressed no apprehensions. He wrote to Drummond on January 31st that he had not seen the acts relating to the Covenant, had no knowledge of them

13. A.P.S., vii.7,16,18; Wodrow, Hist., i.93; L.P., i.70.

until they were passed, and he understood that all they did was to dissolve any obligation upon the subjects of Scotland to reform England by arms or any other seditious way. Nevertheless he foresaw much evil coming upon the kirk. It is evident that the gossip about him continued, for he told Drummond that, contrary to some rumours, Douglas and he were still in close touch, and he had that day given in to the Commissioner and Chancellor a paper written in Douglas's words, which he hoped would have some good result. He enclosed a copy for Drummond that he might see Douglas's moderation. He also informed him that he was endeavouring to have an act passed against profanity and for owning the doctrine and discipline of the church.¹⁴

The paper referred to appears to have been the "overtures" which, Wodrow relates, were presented to Middleton by the Edinburgh brethren. They asked that an interpretation of the oath of Parliament might, for future safety, be passed by an act of Parliament in the same sense that was given verbally to the members when they were required to take the oath; that Parliament should declare that in passing the act concerning the Solemn League and Covenant they did not intend to annul the oath of God under which the people of Scotland lay; that Parliament should pass an act approving and ratifying the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and the Directory for Worship, and acts for suppressing popery and profanity. Middleton and Glencairn promised to communicate their requests to the King and to give an answer later. In the meantime they were

14. Ibid. i.69-70; Row, Life of Blair, 375.

asked to draw up an act of ratification, and this was done. Doubtless it was the act referred to by Sharp.¹⁵

On February 5th Sharp wrote a private letter to Lauderdale in which he complained of the unnecessary length of the session of Parliament and expressed the suspicion that Middleton was relying upon the presence of the militia to support his policy. He described also the rival plans of politicians for bringing the church under control -- "for securing of an interest in England the episcopall partye must be gratified with a moulding of the church heer to ther mind, Sheldon¹⁶ sees this to be the designe of one; but knows it to be dangerous and unpracticable; some are for bringing in somewhat instead of Bishops, others speak of constant moderators, each of these contryvers would have ther designs so carryed as the effect may be attributed only to themselves. This confounding will to my apprehension make a babell which will procure a respite to the present government of this church, which else I fear is not in a steady posture to byd assaults, though our leading men be fixed: if you would have us right, keep a watchfull eye upon the militia and the adjournment of the parliament." Sharp was also careful to inform Lauderdale that neither he nor Rothes was taken into Middleton's confidence.¹⁷

By this time Sharp was admitting that on second thoughts he had come to the conclusion that the rescissory acts already passed destroyed not only the civil sanction of the Covenants but also all legal security for the existing religious government. He had no

15. Wodrow, Hist., i.110-111;

16. James Sharp - See L.P., i.p.ix.

17. N.L.S. MS.98, f.66.

expectation that the act of ratification would be passed and he suggested that Parliament should pass a confirmation according to the terms of the King's letter, which he now considered to be the only sanction for the religious government left to the church.

An act with that object was drawn up in consultation with the ministers and offered to the government on February 15th. Sharp sent Drummond a copy on the 19th telling him he saw little hope of its passing.¹⁸

By that time it had become known that suggestions were being made for taking away all sanctions since 1637, and on the previous night Parliament had ordered all the acts of Assemblies and Commissions of the church since that time to be delivered to the Lord Clerk Register and the Lord Advocate for their perusal. The object was, as all were aware, to look for enactments and resolutions which might be regarded as infringing the King's prerogative, thus to cast odium upon the ministers who had been present, of whom several were to be found among the leading Resolutioners, and to create a prejudice against the granting of the much desired General Assembly.¹⁹

On the 19th Sharp set out for a week's visit to St. Andrews to be inducted as Professor of Divinity of St. Mary's College, a position he had accepted on Lauderdale's advice, given while both were still in London, rather than the call to Edinburgh

18. L.P., i. 72, 74, 75.

19. Ibid. i. 74, 75.

sent to him in March 1660.²⁰ While he was away a motion was brought forward at a meeting of the Lords of the Articles to rescind all acts of Parliament against episcopacy and in favour of presbytery. The discussion which arose was so heated that the Commissioner decided to postpone the matter for a little, but it was agreed with only four dissentients that it should be taken into consideration before the rising of Parliament. The ministers were much alarmed. Douglas and Dickson went to Middleton and Glencairn and succeeded in arranging for a conference on Monday, March 4th, after Sharp's return, to which Douglas, Dickson, Baillie, Smith, Hutcheson and Sharp were invited.²¹ They also wrote to Lauderdale, as Secretary, in order that he might explain the position to the King. They desired that the King should prevent anything being done to the prejudice of the existing church government, and should forbid the examination of the registers until a General Assembly had been called and had taken steps to review the enactments in question -- and this, they assured him, they would do in such a way as to satisfy the King and remove all cause of offence. They reminded him that in an overture already given in they had asserted the King's supreme power in all civil causes, and that the power "formally civil about ecclesiastical affairs, which is competent to any christian magistrate" duly belonged to the King, and would be acknowledged by all of them. They followed up their letter by an "Information", date March 1661. In it they again stressed the desirability of a

20. Lamont's Diary, 132; N.L.S. MS.2512, f.1; Wodrow, Hist., i.12.

21. Row, Life of Blair, 378; L.P., i.77.

holding a General Assembly and insisted that a change in church government would bring suffering to many loyal ministers. Referring to the possibility that Lauderdale might have heard reports that the majority of ministers were hankering after episcopacy, they assured him that there were very few such ministers and they were men of no reputation in the church.²² There is no suggestion that they suspected that Sharp was responsible for such reports. It seems certain that James Wood continued to trust him for some time longer, and Douglas may have done so also. Sharp claimed that at this time he was in frequent consultation with him on everything relating to church affairs.

The conference arranged for March 4th did not take place, but soon after Sharp and Douglas saw Middleton in private. They asked that he would not permit Parliament to rescind the acts, that they might have a General Assembly and that the Commission books of the church might not be called for. He granted their last request and said he would answer the other two when he received his return from England.²³ Finally they asked that a trial of presbyterian government might be made for two or three years that they might have an opportunity of showing that presbytery was consistent with monarchy, but Middleton would give no encouragement to this suggestion.²⁴

By arranging ~~these~~ private meetings Sharp was helping Middleton to avoid formal conferences with ministers. At the same

22. Wodrow, Hist., i.113-117.

23. An express was sent to London about March 5th for instructions concerning the proposed rescissory act. L.P., i.81-2.

24. Ibid. i.85.

time in consultation with Douglas through his letters to Patrick Drummond he was keeping Lauderdale informed of the position, and it was Douglas's hope that Lauderdale might be able to influence the King against the proposed legislation. Sharp was in a difficult position. He had been persuaded that the King was likely to decide in favour of Middleton's policy and, therefore, had made up his mind to assist in carrying it out. At the same time he was anxious to keep on good terms with Lauderdale who strongly disapproved of the rescissory act. He had to take care also that Middleton did not suspect him in relation to Lauderdale. Thus the contents of his letters to Patrick Drummond must not become known in Edinburgh. Douglas was taken into his confidence to the extent that he was shown Drummond's letters to Sharp and told what Sharp intended to reply to them. Doubtless there were passages in the letters of which Douglas knew nothing, for some of Sharp's statements and suggestions could not have failed to arouse his suspicions both of himself and of Lauderdale. Probably the letters gave Lauderdale a sufficiently accurate account of the state of affairs, but they completely failed to convince him of Sharp's loyalty to himself.

According to Sharp's version the rescissory act was part of a plot between the English government and Middleton and his Scottish supporters to destroy the legal foundations of presbyterian church government and they were on the lookout for any attempt to frustrate their plans by Lauderdale and his friends in Scotland. It was for this reason that Sharp did not write directly to Lauderdale, and it was necessary that Lauderdale should be very

careful in his use of any documents or information sent to Drummond by Sharp. For his part Sharp was acting with such care that Douglas was his only confidant. He was of opinion that the plot was likely to succeed. The majority in Parliament were in favour of episcopacy and the church was in no position to resist. The Edinburgh ministers and most of those in Fife would be loyal to presbytery, but elsewhere they would waver except in the west, where the Protesters, whose reputation prevented their opposition from having any weight, were in the majority. He knew that Lauderdale was in favour of holding a General Assembly, and he advocated this course, stating his conviction that the King would obtain by consent of its members more than ever King James sought. This is equivalent to an assertion that the majority of the ministers of the Church of Scotland could be induced to accept episcopacy. Sharp also defended himself against charges that he was Middleton's adviser, declaring that he had not acted for a change and had not touched upon church government in sermons or conferences at the Scottish court or elsewhere. He must often have discussed the matter privately with Middleton and others, but it is quite probably true that he did not attend any conferences on the subject and it is not at all likely that he would have referred to it in sermons or other public utterances.

In the last of these letters, dated March 21st, Sharp explained his personal attitude towards church government. He was of opinion that the substantials of presbyterian government had a foundation in scripture, but he did not believe that every part of

its constitution, as it had been exercised in Scotland of late years, was jure divino or consistent with the subjection due to the King. He himself would be content to live under either a regulated presbytery or a presbyterian presidency, and he was of opinion that the Commissions of the General Assembly of 1647 and 1648 had acted as exorbitantly as the highest prelates. He would, however, take no part in bringing in a constant presidency because of the offence it would give. As for himself he had no private ends in view, he considered he was provided for by the professorship to which he had just been appointed, and his chief desire was to retire from public life and devote himself to his books.

On the same date Rothes wrote to Lauderdale a letter which confirmed Sharp's statements. He asserted that it was the determination of the authorities in London to prepare the minds of the people to return to the ancient church government. He expressed the opinion, formed from his own observation, that four out of five Scots were in favour of episcopacy. He admitted that he himself desired to take away the civil sanction from the existing church settlement in order to show that it was necessary to acknowledge the King's authority, for too many ministers still had the same spirit as formerly. He advised Lauderdale to give way to the inclinations of the King and the majority of the people, warning him that there were men who were anxious for his downfall and would take advantage of any indiscretion on his part. He assured him that Glencairn was his zealous friend and that Middleton was ready to be reconciled.²⁵

25. L.P., i. 79 - 92.

It had been arranged that Douglas and Sharp, together with Wood, should again meet Middleton on March 22nd, but presumably this meeting had no more satisfactory result than the previous one. The next step was taken by the Presbytery of Edinburgh as a body. They drafted a petition to the Commissioner and Parliament that a new act might be made ratifying their church government, and that they would ask the King to call a free General Assembly as soon as possible. They sent their petition to Middleton by John Smith, Robert Lawrie and Peter Blair, the three members they thought most likely to get a good reception. Middleton persuaded them not to present the petition till next day. He then wrote to Primrose, the Lord Clerk Register, asking him to prepare the rescissory act with all speed and, if possible, have it ready for the Lords of the Articles the following morning at 10 o'clock that it might be brought into Parliament in the afternoon. The act, he said, was of the greatest consequence and was likely to meet with many difficulties if not quickly passed, as petitions against it were being prepared. The act was ready in good time, and the it was passed by Parliament on March 28th. On the following day the Presbytery, having heard that there had been considerable opposition in Parliament, sent David Dickson and some others to Middleton to insist that their petition should be read in Parliament, with a draft of an act for the ratification of the constitution of the church, but Middleton roughly refused to grant their request.²⁶

26. L.P., i.90; Wodrow, Hist., i.112-113; Baillie, L. & J., iii.586.

The rescissory act was followed ny an Act Concerning Religion and Church Government, by which the King declared that it was his full and firm resolution to maintain the true reformed protestant religion, in its purity of doctrine and worship, as it was established during the reigns of his royal father and grandfather of blessed memory; and, as to the government of the church, he would make it his care to settle and secure the same in such a frame as would be most agreeable to the word of God, most suitable to monarchical government and most complying with the public peace and quiet of the kingdom, and in the meantime he allowed the existing administration by sessions, presbyteries and synods to continue.²⁷ Thus everything now depended on the King, but in view of his letter of 1660 ministers might still entertain some hope if they could make their views known to him.

The meetings of the provincial synods were due to take place in April and May, and the next move on the part of ministers in those provinces where there was a majority loyal to presbytery was to follow the example of the Presbytery of Edinburgh and bring forward proposals to petition Parliament to pass a law ratifying the presbyterian settlement. The Scottish government had, however, resolved to prevent petitions. Visitors were, therefore, appointed to attend the synods as representatives of the government with orders to dissolve the meeting at the first appearance of any criticism of the legislation which had been passed.

27. A.P.S., vii.86,87-8.

The Synod of Fife met at St. Andrews on April 2nd.

It proceeded with great moderation and efforts were made to placate the government by a resolution that an act should be drawn up admonishing all ministers within the province "so to preach for truth as to abstain from all reflexions upon authority that might give any just cause of provocation." Further, on the motion of James Wood a commission was unanimously appointed to take measures to call to account those who had acceded to the Remonstrance and "The Causes of God's Wrath", and to take away "the scandal and reproach of these two papers". When, however, a discussion was begun on a petition to Parliament and a declaration for fixing ministers and their people in their religion, the Earl of Rothes, who was present as Visitor, immediately dissolved the Assembly.²⁸ Similar action was taken elsewhere. Visitors were sent to all the Synods which were considered likely to petition, and several others were dissolved or prevented from meeting, including those of Lothian, Glasgow and Ayr, Dumfries and Galloway. There was little opposition north of the Tay, and the Synod of Aberdeen sent a petition pointing towards episcopacy.²⁹

It is reported that Sharp at first appeared greatly concerned about the passing of the rescissory act, but that he soon began to express the view that all was for the best since the act made it possible for the government of the church, which had

-
28. Wodrow MS Fol.xxvi.54. (C.of S.); Wodrow, Hist., i.117-122; Lamont's Diary, 134; Row, Life of Blair, 382; Burnet, Own Times, i.
 29. Ibid. Lamont's Diary, 135; Wodrow, Hist., i.122-129; 118.
 Row, Life of Blair, 382; Grub, Ecclesiastical History, iii.181.

been set up during a time of rebellion, to be established by the King and Parliament on a basis which could not be questioned.³⁰

So far Middleton had been successful, but Lauderdale in London was believed to be putting before the King strong objections to the rescissory act and it was feared they might make some impression on him. Sharp wrote to Lauderdale on April 15th, probably in consultation with Rothes, with the object of persuading him to be reconciled with Middleton. Knowing Lauderdale's suspicions of him, he began by protesting his loyalty to him as the man to whom he owed everything, affirming that he had done all that was possible to avert the passing of the rescissory act, but "the great ones" in Scotland had been encouraged by the advice sent by "the great ones above". He lamented the result. "What I foretold is come to pass, v. y^t it would cause a generall dissatisfaction amongst the best of the ministers and people, and yet I fear if it come to the push many of the ministers will shrink, which I perceive by those who preach before the Parliament." He gave his view of the attitude of the Edinburgh ministers. "M. Douglas and others here think that calmness and forbearance to make noyses by petitionings or warnings by ministers and fixing into opposition to a change among ourselves is the best game at present." He finally came to the real object of his letter and suggested that the act had given to Lauderdale the greatest opportunity of being of service to his country -- "providence may have hereby putt into your hand an opportunity to oblige and

30. Burnet, Own Times, i.117.

gratify this poor church more then if that rescission had not been passed: for all beeng putt upon the king, it will be in your lop^s hand to make or unmake us, to fix your interest here which cannot be shaken: if the only wise God would be pleased to order it so as ther could be a good understanding and conjunction made betwixt your lop. and the E. of Mid~~n~~letoun, I would look upon as a token for good to poor Scotland, without which I know not what to look for but a dismall storm ---- if ther could be a demurrer for some time, both upon your lop^s part and upon those who are here, of making any further step in reference to the rescissory act and endeavours usit in the whyl for preparing towards a coalescing betwixt your lo^p and the E. of Midletoun, then you might by joynt conversing fall upon the best expedient for preventing the evils which else will rush upon us; this were the only way in my poor apprehension for an effectuall preventing of a change." He then referred to the letter of Rothes of March 21st, and gave it as his opinion that Rothes had voted for the act to avoid giving encouragement to the Protesters, and warned Lauderdale that it was being said that his attitude was discouraging to those who were loyal to the King and assisting those who were disaffected, and advised him not to lay too much weight upon the statements of some ministers, amongst whom he feared there would be few martyrs. He insinuated that the proceedings of the Protesters were mainly to blame for the support the act had obtained, mentioning as particularly harmful the defence put forward at his trial by James Guthrie, "who hath made the frame of our religion here to be

nothing else but a contrivance of treason and sedition." For his own part, he asserted, he had never gone further towards a change than that the King might have his own place in the church as in the state, without which he did not see how it could be well with either church or state.³¹

This ambiguous letter seems to show that Sharp had now quite definitely come down on the side of episcopacy as the only church polity consistent with the King's prerogative, and that he was trying to show Lauderdale that the only safe course for him to pursue was to do the same.

Very shortly after this it was decided that Glencairn, Rothes and Sharp should go to London at the end of the month to defend the proceedings of Parliament to the King.³² On April 23rd, the day of the King's coronation in England, Sharp again preached before the Parliament and, according to reports, "homologated the doctrine of the episcopal men that had preached before them, and now began to be unmasked, and to be seen in his own black colours, as one that had betrayed the kirk of Scotland."³³ After this, indeed Sharp does not seem to have had much communication with the Edinburgh ministers, but he was still trusted by Wood and Baillie. Before going to London he is said to have asked the Edinburgh ministers for a commission, which was refused, but to have obtained one from the University of St. Andrews, "the plurality being corrupt men, holy learned Mr. Rutherford being now dead."³⁴

31. N.L.S. MS.2512,f.6.

32. A.P.S.,vii.188-9,193,Appx.64.

33. Row, Life of Blair,383.

34. Ibid. 384.

The latter part of the statement seems to be founded on the fact that Sharp consulted James Wood before his journey and had some business to transact regarding St. Andrews University. He wrote to Wood on April 22nd stating that he expected to be asked to go to London and wished to know Wood's mind before giving a definite answer. As there was little time left he asked Wood to come to Edinburgh on Wednesday, the 24th, or, if that were not convenient, to meet him at Burntisland or Kinghorn on the 25th. He would then explain the reason he desired the meeting.³⁵ Presumably it took place, as Sharp wrote to Wood from London. On April 29th, the day on which he left Edinburgh with Glencairn and Rothes, he wrote to Robert Baillie telling him of his journey and that the object was "not in order to a change of the church."³⁶ They reached London on May 6th, and on the 16th Sharp wrote to Wood that he had had two interviews with the King since his arrival, in the course of which he had informed the King that he had no commission to speak of the public affairs of the church, and on being commanded to give his private opinion he had done so according to truth and in the best interests of the church.³⁷ Sharp was, however, already busy with arrangements for the introduction of episcopacy.

35. L.F., i.96-7.

36. Baillie, L. & J., iii.460.

37. "I did it according to truth, and in the way I thought most conducing for preventing of greif and prejudice to good men; I can not by wreating give you an account therof, but I have a testimony within my own breast, and from our best friends here, that I have done no disservice to our church." N.L.S.

Sharp seems to have been entrusted with the task of conciliating Lauderdale, and, although there were difficulties, they were apparently not insurmountable. Sharp found that Lauderdale was offended because no mention of him was made in addresses from the Scottish Parliament and because his advice was never asked, and he suggested to Primrose that he should speak to Middleton and have matters put right in that direction. Primrose took the hint, and Lauderdale seems to have appreciated his action.³⁸ By May 21st Lauderdale had evidently acquiesced in the measures preliminary to the settlement,³⁹ and about June 10th Sharp wrote in a letter to Primrose, "My Lord Lauderdale professes he will clearly go along with my Lord Commissioner and the King's ministers, whoever with you look to him or any else here for obstructing of the publick service, they will be mistaken."⁴⁰ The correspondence with Primrose was occasioned by the fact that it was considered necessary before the adjournment of Parliament to pass some further acts in preparation for the introduction of episcopacy, and Sharp wrote to give Primrose instructions about their drafting. At the same time he gave him information about the general progress of the business.

On May 21st Sharp wrote a long letter to Middleton reporting the results of his interviews with Clarendon and the King. He had had two interviews with the King before May 16th and at least

38. Wodrow, MS. 8^{vo} xi.7, pp.10, 37, 38. (N.L.S.)

39. L.P., ii. p. lxxix.

40. Wodrow, MS. 8^{vo} xi.7, p.35. (N.L.S.)

at least two with Clarendon before May 21st. He learned from Clarendon that everything Middleton had told him of the King's intentions regarding the English and Scottish churches was true. It had been determined that the Scottish settlement should be postponed until Middleton arrived in London after the adjournment of the Scottish Parliament. In the meantime, on Sharp's suggestion, with the approval of the Bishops of London and Worcester (Sheldon and Morley) as well as of Clarendon, it was decided that a proclamation from the King should be drawn up by Sharp and Lauderdale in order to prepare the minds of men to acquiesce in the King's pleasure when it should be made known. The Scottish lords had also seen the King and had approved of this step and of the adjournment of Parliament till the following March, the calling of Middleton to London to wait upon the King, arrangements with regard to the withdrawing of the English militia from Scotland and appointing a commission for presentations to kirks. It was agreed also to instruct Middleton to pass an act that all ministers presented should take the oath of allegiance and to delay the act of indemnity till the next session of Parliament.⁴¹

Meanwhile in Scotland ministers were being daily informed that a change was really intended and the Edinburgh brethren, who had ceased all communication with Sharp, made a last attempt to gain the King's ear by writing to Lauderdale. In a letter dated June 4th six of them (Dickson, Douglas, Hamilton, Smith,

41. L.P., ii. pp. lxxviii-lxxx.

Garven and Hutcheson) asked him to interpose with the King on their behalf. They urged that, if the King would hear any of the ministers who were loyal to presbytery they would undoubtedly be able to show him sufficient reasons for the continuance of presbyterian government.⁴² By the time their letter reached London the proclamation of June 10th must already have been drafted by Lauderdale and Sharp, and it was issued by the Scottish Parliament on June 18th. It announced the King's intention to settle and secure the government and administration of the church "in such a way as may best conduce to the glory of God, to the good of religion, to unity, order, and to the public peace and satisfaction of our kingdom", and in the meantime he commanded his subjects, ministers and others to abstain from meddling with what might concern the public government of the church, either by preachings, warnings, remonstrances, declarations, acts, or petitions of church judicatories or any other way. The proclamation was followed by an act ordaining that all ministers presented to livings should take the oath of allegiance.⁴³

As soon as Parliament rose on July 12th⁴⁴ Middleton, Crawford-Lindsay, Hamilton and others hastened to London, and the meeting of the Scots Council took place at which the King declared his decision to introduce episcopacy. The Scots Council was the Committee of the Scots Privy Council which met in London to advise the King on Scottish affairs. It consisted of the Secretary, the

42. L.P., i. 294-5.

43. A.P.S., vii. 271, 272.

44. Ibid. 367.

the Earl of Lauderdale, who was resident in London, four Englishmen, the Earl of Clarendon, the Duke of Albemarle, the Marquis of Ormond and the Earl of Manchester, and of any of the Scottish nobility who happened to be in London.⁴⁵ On this occasion, according to the different accounts which have been given of it, Middleton, Glencairn, Rothes, Crawford Lindsay and Hamilton were present and took part in the discussion. Middleton, Glencairn and Rothes supported the introduction of episcopacy without qualification, and Glencairn asserted that six to one in Scotland were in favour. Lauderdale suggested that the King should call a General Assembly, or consult the provincial assemblies, or else invite the leading ministers on both sides to come to Westminster for a conference. Middleton replied that neither a General Assembly nor provincial assemblies could be summoned without infringing the act rescissory. Crawford Lindsay argued in answer to Middleton that the act rescissory did not abolish presbytery since it had been confirmed by acts of General Assemblies at which Charles I's Commissioners had been present and these acts had not been repealed. He also urged that provincial assemblies should be consulted, and assured the King that six to one in Scotland were for presbytery. Clarendon said that Lauderdale had given the King sound advice, but Crawford Lindsay's arguments, if admitted, would justify all the Scottish acts of rebellion and render the church independent of the state. The King then closed the meeting, saying that, as he saw the majority were in favour of episcopacy, he had decided to establish the episcopal form of government.⁴⁶

R.P.C.Scot.3rd Ser. i.p.vi. 46. Mackenzie, *Memoirs*, 52-6;
Cf. Burnet, *Own Times*, i.233-6.

... Clarendon, Norton and Sharp remained in London until the end of August. For there was still some business to be done. The King's letter answering the petition to the Privy Council had to be drafted and his instructions regarding the measures necessary to carry it out. Sharp took back to Edinburgh a personal letter from the King to Douglas and Lockhart, by the King's command, wrote a letter to the Edinburgh ministers, presumably in answer to theirs of June 24th. It is probable that Sharp assisted with the drafting of both of these. There were also consultations regarding the appointment of Scottish bishops. It is reported that the

VII

The Restoration of Episcopacy. One of the surviving episcopalian ministers who had been deposed for their loyalty, but Sharp pointed out to Clarendon that these men might have been exhibited by their actions and spirit as without sufficient moderation, and Clarendon responded to this argument decided to leave the whole matter to Sharp. This report is confirmed by an entry in the diary of Douglas of Winton dated August 5th. The English Bishop, who had been called to choose the Scottish bishops, and to that end had been out very early in the morning. He asked Brodie when he would come to the King's house.

The King's house was now known in Scotland before the arrival of Clarendon. When the King for a little before they reached Edinburgh the King had said that the ministers had been under some apprehensions as to what they had expressed in pulpits with some bitterness. The King's house was on August 11th, and

Sharp and Glencairn, Rothes and Sharp remained in London until the end of August, for there was still some business to be done. The King's letter announcing his decision to the Privy Council had to be drafted and his instructions regarding the measures necessary to carry it out. Sharp took back to Edinburgh a personal letter from the King to Douglas, and Lauderdale, by the King's command, wrote a letter to the Edinburgh ministers, presumably in answer to theirs of June 4th. It is probable that Sharp assisted with the drafting of both of these. There were also consultations regarding the appointment of Scottish bishops. It is reported that the English bishops wanted to make choice of some of the surviving episcopalian ministers who had been deposed for their loyalty, but Sharp pointed out to Clarendon that these men might have been embittered by their wrongs and might act without sufficient moderation, and Clarendon impressed by this argument decided to leave the whole matter to Sharp. This report is confirmed by an entry in the diary of Brodie of Brodie, dated August 6th. The English Bishops, Sharp had told him, wanted to choose the Scottish bishops, and he had had trouble to keep out unworthy men. He asked Brodie whom he would have as Bishop of Moray.¹

The King's decision had become known in Scotland before the arrival of Glencairn, Rothes and Sharp, for a little before they reached Edinburgh they were informed that "the ministers had been under some discomposure, which they had expressed in pulpits with some bitterness." Their journey ended on August 31st, and

1. Burnet, Own Times, i.236; Brodie's Diary, 201.

Sharp delivered to Douglas the King's letter. It informed him that the King had resolved to restore bishops, and that, as he had formerly experienced Douglas's affection and good service, he now expected him to improve his interest with the ministers and good subjects of Scotland for disposing them to a due subjection to the royal authority.² According to Sharp's report to Lauderdale, Douglas said he humbly accepted this letter "as a particular respect putt upon him", and he told Glencairn and Sharp that, though he could not give his approbation to episcopacy, yet he would do all he could to dispose the ministers of a differing judgement to moderation and acquiescence in the King's pleasure.

Lauderdale's letter, which followed Sharp immediately after he had left London, was enclosed in a covering letter to Sharp informing him that some amendments had been made to the original draft, which it was desired that he should see, the letter had, therefore, been left open and he was to seal and deliver it after he had read it. Sharp made a copy of it and delivered it to Douglas the day after he had given him the King's letter. It explained the reasons why it had been decided not to call a General Assembly or send for some ministers to go to London, and stated that the King was resolved "to use moderation, and to employ those who will be tender towards such as doe not wilfully oppose." Sharp was enthusiastic in praise of it. He wrote to Lauderdale -- "the reasons you mention why the calling of a Generall Assembly or some ministers to London were mislyked doe hold out that

2. Wodrow MS. Fol.xxvi.70. (C. of S.)

which if putt into practice will be of greatest use for appeasing and quieting the tumultuary arguings and quarrellings about church government which have been too long amongst us; for no better way of peace (without which religion cannot prosper) then to reduce all men to obedience and all questions about the publick administrations to the measures of the laws of the king and his parliament. "

He was optimistic also about its effect upon the ministers. He had a conference in Edinburgh with Douglas, Wood and Baillie before he went to his family at Crail, whence he wrote to Lauderdale on September 6th, and he showed the copy of the letter to ministers in Fife. He thought it would have weight with them and would silence the spirit of opposition among the more considerate. James Wood appears at first to have shown great resentment, not unnaturally considering Sharp's reassuring letter to him from London in May. Sharp now wrote of him that in consequence of Lauderdale's letter he was "much cooled of his heat", and of Hutcheson that he would "act the part expected of him".³

Robert Baillie must have been deeply hurt both by the King's decision and by Sharp's defection. He had refused to doubt Sharp up to the last moment. On July 31st he wrote to Spang concerning the suspicions of others that Sharp was the instigator of the change, "I have always found him so kind a friend to myself, that I will be loath to admit such thoughts of him", and in a letter

3. S.H.S., Misc.i.250-1; N.L.S. MS.2512,f.10. The nature of the contents of Lauderdale's letter to the Edinburgh ministers is known only from Sharp's reply to Lauderdale's covering letter.

addressed to Sharp at London on August 29th he expressed his regret that none of the other ministers now kept correspondence with him and affirmed his belief in the assurance given to him the previous April that Sharp's journey to London was not for a change in the church -- "Let others think and speak of yow as they please, and in their follie give yow matter of provocation, if yow were not wise, grave and fearing of God, yet yow shall deceave us notablie, and doe us a very evident evill turne before I believe it."

Baillie had a kindly and trusting disposition and he seems to have had a real affection for Sharp, to whom he owed much and through whose interest with Lauderdale and the King he hoped to obtain some improvement in the financial position of Edinburgh University. He wrote to him again on October 1st, "Whatever grief my heart has from our changes, and is like to have till I die, I hope it will stand with tearms of great respect to yow from whom I have received so many favours and still expect to receive more", and this letter he signed, "Your twenty year old friend and servant." ⁴

The Privy Council met on September 5th, when Glencairn delivered the King's letter. On the following day a proclamation in the King's name was issued in accordance with his order. In it the King referred to his letter of August 10th, 1660, to the Presbytery of Edinburgh declaring his purpose to maintain the government of the Church of Scotland settled by law, and to the rescissory acts which abolished all the acts relating to church

4. Baillie, L. & J., iii. 468, 473-4, 481

government since 1637 and left it to him to settle the future government of the church. He then stated that, in view of the inconveniences from the church government as it had been exercised for the last twentythree years and its unsuitableness to his monarchical estate, he had resolved to restore the church government by bishops as it was by law in the reigns of his royal father and grandfather and as it now stood settled by law.. Finally he forbade ministers to assemble in their synodical meetings until his pleasure should be known.⁵

The reception given by the people in general to the proclamation probably varied greatly in different parts of the country. Sir Archibald Primrose wrote on September 14th that, so far as was known in Edinburgh, it had met with kindly reception in the burghs where it had yet come, and it was dutifully approved by the writer of Nicoll's Diary.⁶ The attitude of the population doubtless depended very much on that of their ministers. The event showed that in the greater part of the country the majority of ministers were prepared to conform, but nearly all in the west, many in Lothian and Fife and some in other parts were determined to maintain the principles of the Covenant.

Sharp remained in Scotland only about six weeks before he returned to London for consecration as Archbishop of St. Andrews. He is said to have spent this time in preaching against the Covenant and all that had been done in Scotland during the last twentythree

5. R.P.C.Scot. 3rd Ser. i., 28-32.

6. Laing MSSS (H.M.C.) iii.324; Nicoll's Diary, 342-3.

years and in travelling up and down with the object of winning over ministers to the King's point of view, offering them bishoprics and honours.⁷ Robert Douglas, in an account of the introduction of episcopacy written later, related that Sharp had visited him before his journey and he had told him that the curse of God would be upon him for his treacherous dealing, but he wrote nothing of the alleged offer to him of the bishopric of Edinburgh.⁸ It is probable, as has been seen, that the decisions regarding the appointments had been made during ^{Sharp's} ~~his~~ recent visit to London and that those to whom they were to be offered were known to be favourable to episcopacy.

Only one of the former Scottish bishops survived, Thomas Sydserfe, Bishop of Galloway. He was transferred to Orkney, one of the richest of the Scottish bishoprics and almost a sinecure. It must have been a contrast to the turbulent diocese of Galloway, and the appointment would seem to be more suitable to an old man than either that or the Archbishopric of St. Andrews, which was to be held by Sharp himself.

When he set out for London on October 18th Sharp was accompanied by Andrew Fairfoul, minister of Duns, who had supported the Engagement of 1648, and James Hamilton, minister of Cambusnethan, brother of Lord Belhaven. Fairfoul was to be Archbishop of Glasgow and Hamilton Bishop of Galloway. Resident at London at this time was Robert Leighton, Principal of Edinburgh University, a man of saintly character, who had taken the Covenant in 1641 but disapproved of its forcible imposition. He had shown his approval of the

7. Row, Life of Blair, 395; Cf. Nicoll's Diary, 346.

8. Wodrow, Hist. i. 228.

Engagement in 1648, when he was minister of Newbattle, but had been saved from censure by the influence of the Earl of Lothian. He preferred episcopacy to presbytery, but, like the Aberdeen doctors, did not consider presbytery unlawful. He had no desire for high position in the church, and it was only at the King's request ~~that~~ that he reluctantly consented to accept a bishopric. He chose the diocese of Dunblane because it was small in extent and revenue and because the ~~Deanery~~ of the Chapel Royal was attached to it and as Dean he would be able to use the Book of Common Prayer.⁹ These four men were consecrated in Westminster Abbey on December 15th, the Bishops of London (Sheldon), Worcester (Morley), Carlisle and Llandaff officiating.¹⁰ They remained in London until the beginning of April 1662 to be instructed, it was said¹¹ probably with some truth, in their duties by the English bishops.¹²

On their return to Scotland, which they entered on April 8th, they were received with great pomp and ceremony. Sharp went to St. Andrews on April 15th, and on the 20th he preached a sermon in his own defence.¹³ He had, he professed, accepted his office not from ambition but out of obedience to the will of God and the King,

9. Burnet, Own Times, i. 241-2, 245; Nicoll's Diary, 346-7.
Baillie, L. & J., iii. 34.

10. Grub, Ecclesiastical History, iii. 196; Nicoll's Diary, 350; Baillie, L. & J., iii. 485. It was Sharp's practice to consult Sheldon (who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1663) on Scottish church affairs. From 1663 onwards he kept up a regular correspondence with him, as did his colleague, Alexander Burnet, who succeeded Fairfoul as Archbishop of Glasgow. Sharp's Household Book for the years 1664 to 1666 shows also that during his frequent visits to London he made many calls at Lambeth Palace, as well as at Clarendon's residence, Worcester House, and Lauderdale's home at Highgate. Stirton, Leaves, pp. 22 ff.

11. Burnet, Own Times, i. 251-2; Baillie, L. & J., iii. 485; Lamont's Diary 145-7.

whom he acknowledged to be supreme in all causes ecclesiastical: he had never at any time as a result of reading or hearing the arguments of those who were opposed to episcopacy believed that it was contrary to the word of God, unnecessary or useless, much less destructive to the church or prejudicial to the gospel, and his most intimate acquaintances for some years past could bear witness to this: he had never moved the King to bring in episcopacy to the church, but, when he found that he was resolved upon reasons of conscience, honour and state to bring it in, he had not opposed him. He went on to say that, after further studying the question, he had come to believe that episcopal precedence with due subordination of ministers and clergy was a holy and sacred ordinance, that, involving as it did a due subordination, it was most suited to the nature of all men, ministers among the rest, and that it was most convenient for Scotland as it was then united with England and Ireland under one king. The proof of this he found in the confusions and disorders which had arisen in the land after the abolition of episcopacy. He pointed out that no other protestant church but that of Scotland had during the last century condemned episcopacy and that the most eminent men of the reformed churches had approved of it. He then spoke of the sinfulness of entering into covenants against so sacred an order, and begged those who differed from him to look upon themselves as men like himself not infallible but liable to mistakes. Finally he declared that it was the duty of all to submit to lawful authority.¹²

12. N.L.S. MS.597,f.75.

The Commissioner, Middleton, arrived in Edinburgh of May 4th for the new session of Parliament. On the 8th were consecrated the Bishops of Dunkeld, Moray, Caithness, Ross, Brechin and the Isles. The Bishops of Aberdeen, Edinburgh and Argyll had been nominated, but the Bishops of Aberdeen and Edinburgh had been detained in England. They were consecrated at St. Andrews on June 1st and the Bishop of Argyll was consecrated soon after at Glasgow. Two of them, George Wishart, Bishop of Edinburgh, and David Mitchell, Bishop of Aberdeen, were episcopalians who had been deprived of their livings and gone into exile owing to their adherence to episcopacy. Wishart is well known as the author of Memoirs of Montrose. He had accompanied Montrose from Scotland and had later become chaplain to Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia.¹³

Before the sitting of Parliament the Privy Council had been taking steps to prepare the way for the change in church government. On December 12th 1661 they passed an act ordaining that no minister should be admitted to a benefice except on presentation directed to the Archbishop or Bishop of the diocese, and on January 9th 1662, in obedience to a letter from the King, they issued a proclamation forbidding all ecclesiastical meetings in synods, presbyteries and kirk sessions until they should be authorised by the bishops.¹⁴ Parliament met on May 8th and immediately passed an act ratifying the appointment of the bishops

13. Baillie, L. & J., iii. 486, Nicoll's Diary, 365, 366; Lamont's Diary, 145-7; Row, Life of Blair, 406-7, 410-11, 415; Grub, Ecclesiastical History, iii., 197-9.

14. R.P.C.Scot., 3rd Ser. i. 119-20, 125-6, 130-1.

and restoring them to their places in Parliament. The two archbishops and the bishops who had been consecrated and were in Edinburgh were then sent for and admitted to take their seats with the earls.¹⁵ On May 27th legislation was passed restoring the ancient government by archbishops and bishops and all the former rights of the episcopate civil and ecclesiastical. Parliament in its previous session by annulling the Parliament of 1649 had repealed the act of patronages. An act was, therefore, passed, on June 11th declaring that all ministers who had been appointed since 1649 had no right to their benefices, but that all such ministers who should take presentations from their patrons and collation from the bishop before September 20th should retain their livings. An act of the same date provided that May 29th, the anniversary of the King's restoration, should be kept each year as a holy day. On June 24th the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant were declared to be unlawful oaths, and all writing, speaking, preaching and praying tending to stir up dislike of the King's royal prerogative and supremacy in causes ecclesiastical, or of the government by archbishops and bishops were forbidden. On the same date it was enacted that all masters of colleges who did not submit to and own the government by archbishops and bishops and who did not take the oath of allegiance should be turned out, that all ministers should attend the bishops' ~~diocesan~~ synods under penalty of suspension for the first fault until the next synod and deprivation for the

15. A.P.S., vii.370-1. The other bishops took their seats during the session. Ibid. 368.

second fault. Further no one was to be allowed to preach or keep school or be a pedagogue to a person of quality without the bishop's licence and all private meetings or conventicles under pretext of religious exercises were forbidden. Finally on September 5th an act was passed that all persons in public trust should sign a declaration that the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were unlawful oaths.¹⁶

Parliament rose on September 9th, having carried the legislation necessary to restore episcopal government and give to the bishops their former power and authority. To complete the constitution of the church there remained only to pass the act for a National Synod, which became law in the following year. It was by virtue of the acts just passed that the majority of non-conforming ministers were deprived. Some of these were already being dealt with by the Privy Council, mainly men from the west who had been prominent among the Protesters and were now preaching against the new regime. The Edinburgh ministers, James Wood of St. Andrews and some other leading Resolutioners also felt unable to keep silent, and, as they were men of considerable influence, the authorities were unwilling to leave them unnoticed. In September 1661 Douglas had given some sort of assurance that he would use his influence in favour of moderation, but clearly he did not put the same interpretation upon his words as did the government. Early in 1662 reports reached London that Hutcheson and he were constantly

16. A.P.S., vii.376,377-9,405-6.

preaching in favour of the covenants. In view of his old friendship for them Sharp asked Patrick Drummond to warn them of the danger they were running. Drummond thought the danger a very real one, and he wrote to Douglas on February 28th advising him to be moderate and suggesting that he should write to London and vindicate himself and his friends against these aspersions.¹⁷ The ministers do not seem to have heeded the warning, for on June 25th Sharp in a letter to Lauderdale asked him to write to Robert Douglas and David Forret letters to be communicated to others advising them for their own good and that of the church to "comport ther carriages in obedience to the laws."¹⁸ The Edinburgh ministers, however, steadily refused to acknowledge the authority of the bishops, and Parliament shortly took action against some of them. At the beginning of August George Hutcheson, John Smith and James Hamilton were deposed, and in September the Privy Council ordered the other Edinburgh ministers to own and acknowledge the present government of the church before October 1st, on pain of being discharged from the exercise of their ministry within the town and removing from the town at Martinmas next.¹⁹ The only one who conformed was Robert Lawrie, who was made Dean of Edinburgh and later became Bishop of Brechin. These proceedings were unpopular with the people of Edinburgh, who disliked the strangers appointed to succeed their

17. Wodrow MS. Fol.xxvi.72. (C. of S.)

18. N.L.S. MS.2512,f.11.

19. A.P.S.vii.391; R.P.C. 3rd Ser. i.264.

former ministers and "fled their kirks and wandered to other kirks".²⁰

On the day after Parliament rose the Privy Council issued a proclamation that the diocesan meetings would be held by the Archbishops and bishops in October, that all ministers were to attend and that any other ecclesiastical meetings not authorised by the bishops were forbidden.²¹ The attendance at these meetings gave an index of the amount of opposition to the new order which was to be expected. In the west it was poor. Only thirtytwo of about two hundred and forty ministers in the diocese of Glasgow are said to have been present and in Galloway and Argyll only the Bishops' Deans. Many ministers were absent from the Synod of Edinburgh and many of the Fifeshire ministers from the Synod of St. Andrews. In the northern Synods generally there were few absentees. That held by the Bishop of Dunkeld was attended by five sixths of the clergy of the diocese.²² Sharp seems to have been disturbed by the number of recalcitrants in his own diocese. On October 24th he remarked, in a letter to Lauderdale, on "the resolution of some to make a shism in the church, if they can, because they are not pleased."²³

In the west great difficulties soon arose owing to the precipitate action of Middleton and the Privy Council at the instance of Archbishop Fairfoul. Towards the end of September Middleton

20 Wodrow, Hist., i. 298, 299; Row, Life of Blair, 416, 422-3; Nicoll's Diary, 380.

21. R.P.C.Scot., 260-1.

22. Row, Life of Blair, 425-6; Nicoll's Diary, 381; Lamont's Diary, 156; Wodrow, Hist., i. 280, 281; Hunter, Diocese of Dunkeld, i. 126.

23. N.L.S. MS. 22512, f. 13.

accompanied by several members of the Council set out upon a tour of that district to bring pressure to bear on its obstinate ministers. When they arrived in Glasgow the Archbishop complained that few of the ministers in his diocese had applied for presentation and collation, although the date for doing so was now past. He suggested that the Privy Council should order that all ministers who remained obdurate should be forbidden to exercise their functions as ministers and ordered to leave their parishes before November 1st, informing Middleton, it is said, that not ten ministers of the diocese would run the risk of losing their livings. Accordingly the Privy Council met at Glasgow and passed the required act. The result was that the majority of nonconformist ministers in the western counties who had been instituted since 1649 immediately left their charges. A few, however, thought it their duty to stay and look after the spiritual needs of their congregations until they should be turned out by the authorities.

The action of the majority was concerted with a view to embarrassing the government, for it was difficult to find a sufficient number of successors at short notice. A meeting of the Privy Council was called by the Commissioner for November 4th to consider what was to be done. It was ordered that letters should be written to the Archbishops to appear and give their advice, and on the 6th a committee was appointed to confer with them. Sharp was disturbed by what had happened. He wrote bitterly to Lauderdale on November 18th, "Some ministers in the west, Lothian and Fife have as by combination refused to take presentations according to the act of

parliament, or to keep any meetings, or exercise disciplin, because of the lye of the covenant which they hold sufficient to supersead ther duty and obedience; this will necessitat to the voyding of more places then was expected." In order to gain a little more time in which to deal with the situation the Privy Council, on the advice of the Archbishops, issued an order on December ^{23rd} extending the period of grace until February 1st, and many of the ministers returned to their parishes until that date.²⁴

The vacancies were filled during the following year mainly by young men from the north of episcopalian principles, most of whom were newly qualified and inexperienced. They were totally unlike the zealous and serious men whom they succeeded and were unpopular with the people, who resented the extrusion of their own ministers. It is certain, however, that the accusations of ignorance and viciousness brought against them by the covenanters were grossly exaggerated. Many people refused to hear the new ministers and deserted their parish churches, going long distances to the services of the older ministers who had been inducted before 1649 or attending the family worship of the younger ministers who had been turned out, thus beginning the practice of attending conventicles.²⁵

Sharp had been much distressed during the summer and autumn by the hostility between Middleton and Lauderdale, which

-
24. Wodrow, Hist., i. 282-3, 285-6; Burnet, Own Times, i. 268-9; Row, Life of Blair, 423-4; Law, Memorials, 13; R.P.C. Scot., 3rd Ser., i. 273-4, 279, 312; N.L.S. MS. 2512, f. 15.
25. Burnet, Own Times, i. 271, 275; Wodrow, Hist., i. 331-6; Grub, Eccles. Hist., iii. 209; Hunter, Dunkeld, 57.

then came to a head. Owing to the watchfulness of his agent in Scotland, Sharp's brother William, assisted by the Archbishop himself, Lauderdale was able to frustrate Middleton's plot against him, and Middleton's period as Commissioner was now brought to an end. He had been summoned to London, where he went early in January, 1663, and he never returned to Scotland. Rothes was appointed Commissioner to the Parliament which met on June 18th, and Lauderdale came to Edinburgh to sift thoroughly the plot against him, leaving Sir Robert Moray to perform his duties in London.²⁶

Sharp himself went to London at the end of February to give an account of the condition of the church and the steps which had been taken to carry out the King's instructions regarding the setting up of episcopacy. He remained in London till June, presumably because there was a great deal of business to do in relation to the church. The opposition had been much greater than was expected, and doubtless much discussion was necessary on the remedies to be used, and on the legislation which was to complete the church settlement by establishing a National Synod. For these purposes two acts were passed in the ensuing session of Parliament. To deal with the state of affairs which had arisen owing to the unpopularity of the new ministers an act against separation and disobedience to ecclesiastical authority was passed on July 8th, 1663. It provided that the Privy Council should punish all ministers who did not obey the laws enjoining them to seek presentation and

26. N.L.S. MS.2512,f.11; MS.546,f.7; S.H.S. Misc.,i.251;
L.P.,i.106 - 120,134; A.P.S.,vii.448.

collation, attend diocesan meetings and concur with the bishops in the acts of church discipline, and that all people who absented themselves from their parish churches on the Lord's day were to be fined in sums to be esimated according to their incomes.²⁷

On August 21st was passed the act for the establishment and constitution of a National Synod. This was to be the highest of the church courts and was to take the place of the General Assembly. It was to consist of the two archbishops, the bishops, the deans of the cathedral churches, the archdeacons of the dioceses, the moderator and one presbyter from each presbytery and representatives of the universities and Colleges. It was to meet by the appointment of the King and to consider such ecclesiastical matters as should be put before it by the President, the Archbishop of St. Andrews, in the name of the King. It could only meet in the presence of the King or his Commissioner, and no act was to be valid unless approved by the President and the King or his Commissioner. Thus great care was taken that the National Synod should never be in a position to exercise the powers claimed by the General Assembly since 1637, but even so it was never allowed to meet.²⁸

The other courts, which carried on the administration of the church, were the diocesan synod, the presbytery, or exercise, and the Kirk Session. The first two differed from those of the presbyterian church in that the president of the synod was always the bishop, the presbytery was presided over by a constant moderator, who was appointed by the archbishop or bishop, and they had no lay

27. N.L.S. MS.2512, f.17; Lamont's Diary, 160; A.P.S., vii.455.

28. Ibid. vii.465; Grub, Eccles. Hist., iii.216; Hunter, Dunkeld, i.60.

members. They consisted of all the parish ministers of the district. The church courts performed the same functions as under presbytery and exercised the same discipline, but there was no parity in synod or presbytery. The synod was under the sole jurisdiction of the bishop and the presbytery acted under his authority.²⁹

The meetings of presbyteries and kirk sessions had been forbidden by the Privy Council in January 1662 and had been authorised to meet by the synods held in October in the same year, when the bishops appointed constant moderators over the presbyteries. The same synods had made regulations for a regular order in the church services, but the alterations were slight and simply brought back the practices which had been in use before the Westminster Assembly had produced the Directory of Worship. The scriptures were to be read without lecturing, the doxology was to be sung at the end of the psalms, the Creed was to be repeated at baptisms, and the Lord's Prayer was to be used in every service. No attempt was made then or later to introduce a prayerbook. A liturgy was drawn up by the Scottish bishops early in 1666 to be submitted by Sharp to the King for approval, but it was apparently thought to be unwise to proceed further with the matter. By the Rescissory act the Five Articles of Perth had again become the law of the land, but they were not generally enforced, nor were church festivals universally observed.³⁰

29. Hunter, Dunkeld, i. 59.

30. Row, Life of Blair, 425-6; Lamont's Diary, 156; Nicoll's Diary, 386; L.P., ii. pp. xxx, xxxiii; Hunter, Dunkeld, i. 65.

The changes brought about by the introduction of episcopacy were, therefore, mainly changes in church government. In those parts of the country where there was no opposition to the new regime the people worshipped as before under their old ministers and there was no noticeable difference. In the western districts, on the other hand, a revolution had taken place. The Protestant ministers had exercised great influence over the lives of their parishioners and their loss must have been deeply felt.³¹

31. See Burnet, Own Times, i. 271-2.

At the close of the Parliament of 1663 the stage was set for the struggle which ended in a compromise settlement after the revolution of 1688, when both monarchy and church had given up their absolutist claims. The effective resistance to the settlement was carried on by the Protesters, and Sharp was not wrong in his opinion that very few Resolutioners would refuse to accept episcopacy. He is reported to have told the King that not twenty of them would oppose the new establishment.¹ There was some exaggeration in the statement, for, according to an authority with strong covenanting sympathies the actual number was forty,² but that is not a very large proportion of some six or seven hundred ministers. They included, however, the majority of the leading and most respected men of the party. They were the older men who had taken an active part in all proceedings since 1637, and there seems to have been a widespread reaction against the Covenant in the ranks of the younger ministers.³ With the Protesters, on the other hand, it was the young men who were the most zealous, and many of the older ministers were submissive.⁴ That there was a strong reaction among the general population also is clear, and even some of those who had been zealous for the Covenant had become doubtful of its wisdom and unable to justify it entirely. Alexander Brodie of Brodie and Alexander Jaffrey, both of whom had been prominent covenanters, discussed the subject in June 1662. They

1. Burnet, Own Times, i.234;

2. Row, Life of Blair, 362.

3. See above, pp. 97, 118.

4. Kirkton, Hist., 144, 203.

They agreed that there were some things in the Covenant unlawful, and they were bound to repent of this, that, as God's name was interposed, it was not to be broken lightly, but were it to swear again it would stumble many, seeing what ^{had} ensued. Brodie's position with regard to episcopacy was that he disliked the change but he would be obedient to the laws.⁵ Jaffrey had become a quaker.

The King had expressed his intention of employing moderate men to carry out the church settlement. Sharp also declared himself to be in favour of moderation, and at the first appearance of opposition he had told Lauderdale that he was prepared to wait with patience to give men time "to make the retreat with credit."⁶ Some men who had at first resisted did conform,⁷ but it was of no avail to give time to men who were ready to sacrifice everything for the sake of conscience. Since about two thirds of the population acquiesced in episcopacy, it had not been anticipated that it would be so difficult to suppress the resistance of the rest. The act of Glasgow was much blamed for the troubles by the supporters of the government, and their opponents agreed with them. The historian, Kirkton, wrote in justification of the ministers who left their congregations without waiting to be ejected, "Had they stayed till they had been turned out forcibly one by one, and their places planted immediately, as Bishop Sharp designed, the change had never been so sensible, nor the opposition to Bishops so considerable; whereas Providence made the course ministers took the first act of clear opposition to that course, by the alienation it made upon the people,

5. Brodie's Diary, 266-7, 254-5.

6. NL.S. MS.2512, f.11.

7. Row, Life of Blair, 439.

and the break it made upon the country, the bishops and all their might was never able to heal."⁸

Sharp's policy was the same as that of Clarendon and the the English bishops in England, the strict enforcement of the law, but this policy he was never able to carry out. His letters, and those of Alexander Burnet, Archbishop of Glasgow, to Lauderdale and Sheldon are full of complaints that they did not receive the help they should have had from the other members of the Privy Council.⁹ There was much discontent among the Scottish nobility, who often showed their dissatisfaction with the government and their dislike of the bishops by neglecting to take effective action to restrain disorders. Sharp seems to have been proved right by the fact that the policy of leniency tried by Lauderdale after the Pentland rising was a failure and Lauderdale found it necessary to adopt repressive measures once again. Robert Leighton, Bishop of Dunblane, whose great desire was for reconciliation, found the explanation of the government's failure in the ^{fact} that there was too great rigour on the one hand and too many relaxations and indulgences on the other. He blamed also the cessation of kirk sessions and presbyteries from January to October 1662, which meant a relaxation of discipline for that period, and also the fatal act of Glasgow.¹⁰

For Sharp the only possible policy was the enforcement of the law, for he could not conciliate the presbyterians, who regarded

8. Kirkton, Hist., 152.

9. N.L.S. MS.2512; L.P., ii. Appx. A.

10. H.M.C. 11th Report, Pt. vi. Appx.

him as a traitor to the Kirk of Scotland, to the Covenant and his own convictions. It seems most probable, however, that so long as episcopacy was maintained nothing would have prevented the extremists from resisting the law. The real reason of the government's failure was the self sacrificing zeal and fanaticism of the Protesters of the west.

There can be little doubt that Sharp was betraying his colleagues in the early months of 1661. It seems improbable, however, that he was betraying his own convictions. The fact that the covenanting movement produced in him its traitor may be regarded as a just retribution for the intolerance which compelled many men to live lives of dissimulation. Like many others, Sharp had in his youth been forced to accept the Covenant and presbytery or give up his means of livelihood and his career. That he subscribed the National Covenant after Charles I had ratified it was not inconsistent with the principles in which he had been educated by the Aberdeen doctors, who did not consider presbytery unlawful, but, if he was to satisfy his ambition to succeed, or even be certain of keeping his position, he must conceal any episcopalian tendencies he may have retained and obey unquestioningly the decisions of the General Assembly. When divisions arose in the church he naturally joined the moderate party, and he found no difficulty in maintaining loyalty to them during the commonwealth. As agent of both Monck and the Resolutioners he had to try and reconcile two loyalties. It soon seems to have become clear to him that the aim of the Resolutioners to bring in the King on Covenant terms was impracticable

and, that, if they continued to insist upon it, they were likely to destroy all possibility of retaining the presbyterian settlement in Scotland. He was not completely frank with them, for he did not let them know that Lauderdale and he were encouraging the English presbyterians to accept an accommodation with episcopacy. If he had done so he would have had no further influence with them, and he would not have been able to perform the services desired of him by Monck, Lauderdale and the King.

There is, however, no reason to believe that he was not ~~until the end of 1660~~ ^{then} co-operating loyally with Lauderdale to bring about the presbyterian settlement which Lauderdale desired. The settlement contemplated would doubtless have involved a managed General Assembly subservient to the state, but probably it would have been accepted by the Resolutioners in their anxiety to prove that presbytery was consistent with monarchy. In any case they did not really want a free Assembly, for they wished to exclude the Protesters. It would have been a more satisfactory settlement. There would have been trouble with the Protesters, the majority of whom would have been deposed, but the opposition would have appeared less reasonable and would have been less widespread and, therefore, more easily dealt with. The episcopalians would still have been persecuted, but, as they were less fanatical than the Protesters they would have suffered less, and they might have been provided with livings in England.

In spite of rumours to the contrary it seems probable enough that Sharp was still working loyally with Lauderdale until

the end of the year, for everything he wrote at this time and everything that is reported of his words and actions is quite consistent with this theory. He seems to have been able to persuade the moderate presbyterians to make no mention of the Solemn League and Covenant and to have been trying to bring them to the point of ^{repudiating} the General Assembly's attitude to the Engagement of 1648, on the ground that they were carried away by the extremists. He was apparently not completely successful in this, and Middleton seems to have convinced him in January 1661 that the King was not able to trust the presbyterians to the extent of granting them a General Assembly and that the establishment of episcopacy was inevitable. Sharp then entered wholeheartedly into Middleton's plans, at the same time trying to retain the confidence of Lauderdale and win him over to the episcopal solution.

His co-operation with Middleton involved him in treachery to his colleagues, who, as Robert Baillie wrote, trusted him as their own souls.¹¹ He realised fully what it meant to them, as is shown by his assertion to Patrick Drummond that he would not be accessory to bringing in bishops, or even constant moderators, because of the suffering it would cause to many.¹² Nevertheless he decided to betray his friends in order to realise his ambition. In so doing he entered upon a life of unremitting toil, in which he experienced much disappointment and many humiliations, and which ended in his cruel murder by some of the most extreme and desperate fanatics whom he was oppressing. He would have been happier if, in

11. L.P., i, 96.

12. Ibid. i. 88-9.

accordance with the intention he expressed, probably not sincerely, to Patrick Drummond, he had retired from public life in the spring of 1661. and devoted himself to the duties of his professorship at St. Andrews,¹³ where he might have lived a useful and honoured life.

From the point of view of the episcopalian church Sharp's appointment as Archbishop was probably a mistake. It was no doubt due to the great ability and experience which made his services invaluable to the unscrupulous men who governed the country, but owing to the prejudice created by his treachery it tended to defeat the aims of those who wished to win over the more moderate presbyterians by methods of conciliation.

13. L.P., i. 77-8, 86-7.